VOLUME XVI SPRING 1956 NUMBER 2

Public Administration Review

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The American Society for Public Administration

To Advance the Science, Processes, and Art of Public Administration

---

Public Administration Review

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Volume XVI SPRING · 1956 Number 2

Published quarterly, in February, May, August, and November, by the American Society for Public Administration, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Entered as second class matter February 7, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1897, with additional entry at Brattleboro, Vermont.

The contents of *Public Administration Review* are indexed in Public Affairs Information Service, International Index to Periodicals, and Index to Legal Periodicals. They are microfilmed by University Microfilms.

Subscriptions: domestic, $8 a year; foreign, $8 a year. No discount to agents.

Single copies: $2.

Annual membership dues: sustaining members $15 or more; members $8; junior members (those 28 years of age or under) $4; student members $4. Of the amount paid for membership dues, $4 is allocated to the subscription to *Public Administration Review*. Address: American Society for Public Administration, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

IN THIS NUMBER

LOUIS BROWNLOW was commissioner of the District of Columbia, 1915-20 (president of the board, 1917-20), following fifteen years of varied newspaper experience. Subsequently, he was city manager of Petersburg, Virginia, and Knoxville, Tennessee, and director, Public Administration Clearing House, 1931-45. He is now a consultant to PACH. He is the author of *The President and the Presidency*, 1949, and *A Passion for Politics*, 1955. He is currently engaged in the writing of the second volume of his autobiography. He is a past president of the American Society for Public Administration.

FERREL HEADY is associate professor of political science and assistant director, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan. He was on leave during 1953-54 to serve as director and chief adviser for the Philippine Institute of Public Administration. Other experience includes administrative assistant to the director of personnel, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1941-42, and assistant to Commissioner James K. Pollock, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, 1947-49. He is the author of *Administrative Procedure Legislation in the States,* and co-author of *The Michigan Department of Administration.*

ROBERT H. PEALY is research associate, Institute of Public Administration, and lecturer, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan. He was assistant registrar at the University of Akron, 1946-49. He is a member of the Governor's Educational Finance Study Commission in Michigan. He is the author of *A Comparative Study of Illinois and Michigan Property Tax Administration,* and is co-author of *The Michigan Department of Administration.*

SAMUEL L. KESSLER has been employed by the State of New York since 1936. He has served for the past seven years in the administrative planning units of the Division of Employment, the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Department of Civil Service, and the Conservation Department. He is a member of the New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Methods and Procedures, representing the Conservation Department. He has a B.A. degree from the University of Michigan and an M.P.A. degree from New York University. He is a past director of the New York Capital District Chapter of the Society, and was editor of the chapter's *Yearbook* for 1955.

IN THIS NUMBER

LOUIS BROWNLOW was commissioner of the District of Columbia, 1915-20 (president of the board, 1917-20), following fifteen years of varied newspaper experience. Subsequently, he was city manager of Petersburg, Virginia, and Knoxville, Tennessee, and director, Public Administration Clearing House, 1931-45. He is now a consultant to PACH. He is the author of *The President and the Presidency,* 1949, and *A Passion for Politics,* 1955. He is currently engaged in the writing of the second volume of his autobiography. He is a past president of the American Society for Public Administration.

FERREL HEADY is associate professor of political science and assistant director, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan. He was on leave during 1953-54 to serve as director and chief adviser for the Philippine Institute of Public Administration. Other experience includes administrative assistant to the director of personnel, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1941-42, and assistant to Commissioner James K. Pollock, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, 1947-49. He is the author of *Administrative Procedure Legislation in the States,* and co-author of *The Michigan Department of Administration.*

ROBERT H. PEALY is research associate, Institute of Public Administration, and lecturer, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan. He was assistant registrar at the University of Akron, 1946-49. He is a member of the Governor's Educational Finance Study Commission in Michigan. He is the author of *A Comparative Study of Illinois and Michigan Property Tax Administration,* and is co-author of *The Michigan Department of Administration.*

SAMUEL L. KESSLER has been employed by the State of New York since 1936. He has served for the past seven years in the administrative planning units of the Division of Employment, the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Department of Civil Service, and the Conservation Department. He is a member of the New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Methods and Procedures, representing the Conservation Department. He has a B.A. degree from the University of Michigan and an M.P.A. degree from New York University. He is a past director of the New York Capital District Chapter of the Society, and was editor of the chapter's *Yearbook* for 1955.

Glenn G. Morgan received B.A. and M.A. degrees in political science from the University of Oregon in 1949 and 1950; studied for a Ph.D. degree in political science at the University of Virginia in 1950-52 under a Philip Francis DuPont Senior Fellowship; began work as a research analyst in the National Security Agency in June, 1952; and is attending Harvard University during 1955-56 on an agency fellowship, enrolled in the Soviet Union Program.

John M. Gaus is professor of government, Harvard University. He has been a member of the faculties of Amherst College and Chicago, Minnesota, and Wisconsin Universities. He has been employed in research, extension work, or consultation in national, state, and local government agencies and is the author of a number of books and articles in public administration and related fields. He is a past president of the American Society for Public Administration.

Charles McKinley is professor of political science at Reed College; past president of the American Political Science Association; former consultant to the Pacific Northwest Field Committee of the Department of Interior and to the National Resources Planning Board; former executive secretary of the Administrative Council of the U. S. Department of Agriculture; and author of *Uncle Sam in the Pacific Northwest.*

Frederick J. Lawton was engaged for more than thirty years in fiscal activities in the U. S. Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget. He was director of the Bureau of the Budget, 1950-53, and served for a short time as administrative assistant to President Truman. He was appointed a member of the U. S. Civil Service Commission by President Eisenhower in April, 1953.

Public Administration Review is intended to promote the exchange of ideas among public officials and students of administration. The various views of public policy and public administration expressed herein are the private opinions of the authors; they do not necessarily reflect the official views of the agencies for which they work or the opinions of the editors of this journal.

Woodrow Wilson and Public Administration

By LOUIS BROWNLOW

Consultant, Public Administration Clearing House

THIS year, 1956, in many parts of the world, in many universities, in many states and countries, in many cities, we are celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of a great American scholar, politician, administrator, and statesman, Woodrow Wilson.

I think it is particularly appropriate for the American Society for Public Administration to play a part in this centennial celebration. And since no topic was assigned to me, I decided I would today pay my personal tribute to Mr. Woodrow Wilson.

When the *Public Administration Review* was founded as the organ of this Society sixteen years ago, it was our purpose to start that journal with an acknowledgment of Mr. Wilson's leadership in our field. It was our purpose to begin Volume I, page 1, with a certain essay. It was an essay first published in the second issue of the *Political Science Quarterly* of Columbia University, an essay written by Woodrow Wilson, a young instructor then engaged in teaching politics to girls at Bryn Mawr College. He entitled his essay, "The Study of Administration."

It is significant, I think, that while administration was then already being taught in a few American institutions of learning, this particular essay has often since that time been considered to be the very beginning of the study of the "science of administration," as Mr. Wilson called it, and it also has inspired a great many who did not take that formal educational course but who learned to practice the art of administration.

Let us remember that that essay was published in 1887. We desired to start the new *Public Administration Review* with it. We asked Columbia University, of course, for permission to publish it and, of course, Columbia University refused. But Columbia did then do something that was very useful. In every library in the United States the original essay had been so thumbed over that the pages were tattered and torn, and it was difficult to read, so the *Political Science Quarterly* of Columbia University, in its December, 1941, issue, reprinted it and with it was also a photostatic copy of Mr. Wilson's letter in which he submitted it to the editor, Dr. Edwin R. A. Seligman.

And furthermore, it accompanied the republication by another essay, entitled "A Professor with a Style," written about Mr. Wilson by another professor with a style—Lindsay Rogers—which, too, is well worth your reading.

That letter from Mr. Wilson to Mr. Seligman had a very significant date. It was written on the 11th of November, 1886—the 11th of November, which later became Armistice Day—the 11th of November, which later always was celebrated by a great number of Mr. Wilson's friends in the street in front of his house on S Street here in Washington—and on that day in 1955, this centennial celebration was launched at the University of Virginia.

Remember, Mr. Wilson wrote in 1886. At that time the population of the United States was just over the 50-million mark, and now it is well over 160 million. At that time, there were thirty-eight states in the Union, not forty-eight. At that time, there was a Democratic President, Grover Cleveland, in the White House, something that to some persons seemed almost impossible so soon after the Civil War. At that time, Mr. Wilson could look back as a writer on some of his earlier works. There had

NOTE: This article was a luncheon address at the annual conference of the American Society of Public Administration, March 10, 1956.

been in 1879—incidentally, the year in which I was born—the acceptance by an editor named Henry Cabot Lodge of his first published essay, which seemed to indicate his firm belief that the success of the American experiment in government would be in some manner proportioned to our acceptance of the British parliamentary and Cabinet system.

Then, in 1884 at The Johns Hopkins University, he wrote his doctoral dissertation on *Congressional Government.* Baltimore then was only a little over forty miles from Washington—just as it is now—but Mr. Wilson had never visited his nation's capital. He wrote from a scholar's cell. In it he expressed most convincingly his analysis of the nature of the government of the United States as it was then being conducted, chiefly by autonomous congressional committees with little executive direction.

Mr. Walter Lippmann a few weeks ago noted what many scholars had already noted, that in the book *Congressional Government,* Mr. Wilson apparently came right up to the very brink of making recommendations for remedies along the line of his previous writings, but then shrank from them. Mr. Lippmann speculated that this was because of the campaign waged in 1884 by Grover Cleveland, the Democratic nominee for President, in which he promised that if he were elected he would reassert what I believe he called "the proper prerogatives of the Presidential office," but which Mr. Wilson thereafter translated into "the positive leadership of the Presidential office." Certainly this change of opinion later was sharpened by the events of the war with Spain when, for the first time, the United States seemed to be on its way to becoming a world power and not merely a defender of the Monroe Doctrine and, through the Canning Doctrine, a beneficiary of the Pax Britannica.

At any rate, he left out the remedial section of his dissertation. And then in 1900, when *Congressional Government,* an extraordinarily successful book, was going into its fifteenth edition, he wrote a new preface for it. In that preface, he expressed the opinion that what he had said in it in 1884 was probably already obsolete. By 1908, in his lectures on *Constitutional Government* at Columbia University, Mr. Wilson set up the theoretical standards for the exercise of the positive leadership of the President in our political and social economy.

In that preface it is easy to discern now what was actually admiration, in spite of his political distaste for William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt. Whether it was William McKinley who was the first of our modern Presidents or Theodore Roosevelt, certainly Mr. Wilson at the turn of the century began his crusade for recognition of the necessity of presidential leadership in this government.

Back in 1886 when he wrote his essay on "Administration," he recalled to his readers the fact that ever since the Civil War—and that was then not so long ago, only twenty years—we had been talking about the civil service and the problem of government personnel. He expressed the hope that we would get a civil service career system, based on merit. Then, he said, that would prove to be not enough. Once we got good personnel, we would have to have an intensive study of organization and methods. He did not say merely "O and M." Later on, toward the end of the essay, although not in precisely the same context, he used the word "management." I hope that everybody who has read the essay and who is interested, as all of us are, in the study of administration, will reread it. You will find it in the libraries in the December, 1941, issue of the *Political Science Quarterly.* If you do not find it there, the Public Affairs Press of Washington has just recently reprinted it and you can buy it for $1.00 plus postage.

I first knew Mr. Wilson just half a century ago. I met him first in 1906. He was a school teacher and I was innocent of schooling, but he gave me a lesson, albeit it was in journalism and not in administration.

I had already been in Washington for a year or so as a Washington correspondent, but when Congress was not in session I was back in Tennessee as the state political editor of the *Nashville Banner.* The paper had decided in 1906 that I should stay in Washington the year round, and I was asked to find a substitute as political editor—somebody with whom I could overlap and in a period of six weeks indoctrinate in the tricks of that particular job.

I selected a young man on the Clarksville,

Tennessee, *Leaf-Chronicle*. One day he told me that his brother was coming to Chattanooga to make a speech. His brother was then president of Princeton University. My student —who was Joseph Ruggles Wilson—asked me to go to Chattanooga with him to hear his brother, which I did. There, I had about two hours with Woodrow Wilson.

Woodrow Wilson was very much interested in the fact that his brother was going to be a state political editor. He said:

"Joe, get some library cards and keep full notes, everything you can find, about every major political character in the state: what he does and what he says. That will be of great help to you because then, when something comes up, you can rely on your own recorded data and not on your memory, and you will be a more accurate journalist. I sometimes think the greatest lack in this country on the part of the journalist is accuracy."

I'm afraid I did not take this lesson too seriously, but Joe did. Many years later, when Mr. Wilson was in the White House, he got into a hassle with a senator from Tennessee. I happened to go to the White House to see the President about some business of the District of Columbia, of which I was then a commissioner. The President asked me if I remembered our meeting in Chattanooga and then opening a desk drawer, he said:

"Joe kept that file, and here it is, and now I have that fellow where I want him."

He also said: "If I had a similar file from every state in the union, my political position would be absolutely impregnable."

Of course, I was a journalist. I had had no notion of becoming a public administrator. I was made a public administrator by the grace of Woodrow Wilson when, in January of 1915, he appointed me one of the commissioners of the District of Columbia. Shortly after I took office I went to the White House to see the President and to thank him for my appointment.

"I have one bit of advice for you," he said, and again I met Woodrow Wilson the teacher.

This is the lesson he gave me on public administration:

"I have learned something about administration since I left Princeton," he said. "I learned it at Trenton when I was Governor, and what I learned there has stood me in good stead here in the White House. It has deepened my conviction that this is a prime principle for a public administrator. It is this:

"If somebody comes to see you, and you have the slightest reason to suspect that his motives are ulterior—take high ground. The chances are, he will leave your office before he dares broach his proposition."

That is one lesson that I did take to heart and it did stand me well on many occasions.

I often saw Mr. Wilson grim and determined; I sometimes saw him stern and unyielding; but sometimes I saw his lighter side.

On the 1st of April, 1915, I went with my colleagues, the other two commissioners, and several other persons to see Mr. Wilson in the evening. We sat around the desk in his upstairs study. We discussed various problems that were then important in the government of the District of Columbia. He said:

"I believe I have taken more interest in the municipal government of the District than has any one of my recent predecessors. It is, as you know, because I have had such a deep interest in municipal government."

He went on to say something about his association with the Short Ballot Association, something about his early support of the council-manager form of government, and then we went into the very difficult problems of the relationship of the Public Utilities Commission, of which the District commissioners were then the ex-officio members. Here, he gave us a comprehensive lecture on the regulatory processes, and warned us to hold the balance even between regulation on the part of the government and free enterprise on the part of the privately owned utilities.

That night I saw Mr. Wilson, the teacher, once again.

One of the men there was Frederick L. Siddons, my immediate predecessor as commissioner, whom Mr. Wilson had just appointed Judge of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. He was the great-grandson of Sarah Siddons, the famous English actress who ruled the London stage at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century.

It was a great error that Fred Siddons ever went into the law. He should have gone on the stage. He was a man of courtly presence, a master of beautiful English, in diction and in enunciation, and his friendship with Mr. Wilson endured until Mr. Wilson's death. He was one of the few persons who, after Mr. Wilson's retirement from the White House, was continually in contact with Mr. Wilson. He was a great conversationalist. And he also was extremely polite.

During the course of this conversation, Mr. Wilson got up to turn to a bookcase to get a book that he thought we ought to read. This book contained the correspondence of one of his British mentors, Jeremy Bentham, with one of his predecessors, Andrew Jackson.

Mr. Wilson had lost the sight of one eye in his illness in 1906, and thereafter he preferred to read by the pale yellow light of a kerosene student-lamp. As he rose to get the book, which was right behind him, Siddons automatically also rose. As he did so, his elbow struck the lamp. The lamp turned over. The oil blazed up. An usher rushed in. Rugs were thrown over the desk, and the flames were smothered out. As the excitement died down, Mr. Wilson said:

"Siddons, I am astounded by your conduct. The English burned this house once. That was a hundred years ago, and now you are trying to do it again."

Poor Siddons was miserable. But the President went on:

"I am particularly astonished that you would try to start the fire just here on this desk; this desk, made from the timbers of H.M.S. "Victory," on which Lord Nelson won the Battle of Trafalgar and on which Lord Nelson died, is the desk presented to President Buchanan by Queen Victoria in gratitude for his entertainment of her eldest son, the Prince of Wales, later King Edward VII."

That happened a little after nine o'clock. There was no more serious conversation. The party kept on until twelve and, at the stroke of twelve, in came William Jennings Bryan with an urgent note from Mexico. Mr. Wilson bade us good-bye and said, "Now I go to work for Mr. Bryan."

But most of that evening was spent in matching stories, some of them dialect stories, and a great many Limericks, of which Mr. Wilson was very fond.

That night I saw Mr. Wilson's humorous side.

On the fifth of June, 1917, I also saw him in another mood. It was after the United States had entered the First World War and the Selective Service System had been established. On that day, the fifth of June, when the first registration was taken for the draft, the United Confederate Veterans were meeting in Washington for the first and only time. I took two Confederate veterans, each of whom had been a captain in my father's company in the Confederate Army, and with them the head of the Grand Army of the Republic—a Union veteran whom I had appointed to head the Selective Service in the District—to call on Mr. Wilson.

The two old men in Gray and the one old man in Blue tried to talk to the President of their reunited nation, but words were faltering and eyes were brimming with tears.

That afternoon I saw Mr. Wilson's sentimental side.

It was on that April night which I have already told about—a meeting that would have been called by some of his students at Princeton a bull session—when Mr. Wilson met for the first time the new chief of police of the District, whom I had appointed. He was Major Raymond W. Pullman. That was his first day on the job.

"I have but one word of advice for you, Major Pullman," said the President. "Of all the persons on this earth the one I despise most is someone who, because of his wealth or his social position, seeks to escape the minor regulations which are so necessary for the conduct of affairs in a modern American city. I see some persons have their carriages put up in front of other carriages at White House receptions. That is utterly wrong. And although I do not know what traffic ordinance applies, I see that when a motorcycle policeman gets close enough to my car, he fades away. I want that sort of thing stopped, and stopped now."

Just about that time, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company had invented a thing called a "conference circuit," and the first one had been installed in Washington.

The first use of it was made for the new chief of police to call at the same instant all of the eleven precinct captains of police. Now Major Pullman had not been a policeman, he was not a career man—he had been a journalist—but he had been a police reporter and he knew his stuff. He repeated the President's instruction to eleven incredulous police captains.

The next day, Mr. Tumulty was arrested.

Curiously enough, I believed Joe when he told me with great indignation over the telephone that he had asked the chauffeur to slow down because he had to read something before he got to the White House. But all I said in reply was, "Joe, your story sounds good. Tell it to the judge."

The next afternoon, Miss Margaret Wilson was arrested. The next afternoon, Miss Helen Bones, the President's cousin, was arrested. The next afternoon, Mrs. McAdoo was arrested. And all I said to Mr. Tumulty, who complained bitterly, was, "Tell it to the judge."

Then I received a delegation of journalists, distinguished journalists—the top heads of all the Washington correspondents came down from the White House to see me. "We don't like to see you fired," they said, "but you know the President. One thing he will not tolerate is interference with the ladies of his family. You have to put a stop to this persecution." And I said, "Let the White House drivers stop violating the traffic ordinances." They went away shaking their heads sadly.

But every morning, Miss Margaret Wilson would call me and say, "Father is having the time of his life. He comes in every evening to dinner and asks, 'Who's been pinched today?' "

So, Mr. Wilson taught me something else: When you are in public administration, back up your subordinates; as long as you have delegated anything to them, back them up. When you are no longer able to do so, then revoke the delegation or dismiss the délégué.

He taught me many things about administration but, of course, he was first of all and always the statesman and he based his statesmanship on politics, high politics, the grand politics of a leader of men.

During the beginning of his administration, he had very great influence on public opinion in the country, and he achieved a closer tie with the legislative branch than had any President since Thomas Jefferson.

In the early days of February this year, I had the privilege of listening to Dr. Arthur W. Macmahon's magnificent paper prepared for the centennial celebration at the University of Chicago: it was called "Wilson, the Politician and Administrator." And, at the same time, another brilliant article, by Marshall E. Dimock of New York University, on "Wilson and Domestic Reform."

According to these scholars Mr. Wilson had almost forgotten his 1887 essay on "The Study of Administration" by the time he reached the White House, but I doubt that he had. In that essay, he said that political science had been a topic of study for more than two thousand years; that the study of administration had come into focus only in the middle of the nineteenth century; that during the lifetime of all of the current British and American students of governmental processes we had concerned ourselves with constitutional problems, with political theories, with legislation; but that the main question we asked was who will make the laws and what laws shall they make?

Then he went on to express his regret that the new books that were available with which one could lead students in the study of administration were built around the French and the German administrative systems. These, excellent as they were, as he said, were necessarily adapted to the uses of centralized nationalist states, and what we needed in the United States, for its expanding future, was a system of administration which would be adaptable to the decentralized government of a federal republic.

I shall not attempt to detail further what in that one essay he laid down as a program of study which I think everyone in this Society, everyone of us who is interested in either the art or science of public administration, would do well to read again and to heed.

I esteem it for myself a very great honor to be able to speak to this Society for Public Administration, with which I have had such close and intimate association since the day of foundation, in a centennial tribute to Woodrow Wilson, a pioneer and a very founder of the study of the science and the art of public administration in this country.

The Michigan Department of Administration; A Case Study in the Politics of Administration

By FERREL HEADY
and ROBERT H. PEALY

Institute of Public Administration
University of Michigan

THE Michigan Department of Administration, a central management agency which is responsible for most of the "housekeeping" activities of the state government, was created and began to function in 1948.

In commentaries on similar central management agencies and their work, references to the political environment of state government have been rare. The advocates of agencies like the Michigan department, together with the commentators on those which have been created, have seemed to assume that such agencies function in a "pure" administrative atmosphere, uncontaminated by political or policy considerations.

This assumption is certainly not justified in the case of the Michigan department. Although it is generally conceded, even by its severest critics, that the department has made considerable advances in the technical management aspects of state housekeeping activities, the department has been inextricably enmeshed in the complexities of "politics" in Michigan. Political forces presided over the birth of the department and have influenced it continuously since. Its future may well depend on its acceptability to dominant political groups, and their decision may not necessarily be based on an objective evaluation of its technical record. Consequently, its "political" life has perhaps been the most important and significant feature of the department's history. It is the purpose of this article, therefore, to attempt an assessment of the political ramifications of the department's activities.

The department is designed in theory, and functions in practice, as a staff agency to the Governor. It is organized with divisions of budget, accounting, purchasing, building, property management, motor transport, and office services. Through selection of the department head—the controller—who is subject to his direction, and who serves at his pleasure, the Governor is in a position to give direction to department actions. The agency is thus designed to strengthen the office of the Governor in administrative management.

Prior to the creation of the Department of Administration in 1948, the most notable attempt to centralize Michigan's housekeeping functions had been the creation in 1921 of the State Administrative Board. As we shall see, the relationships between this board and the department have been of very great significance. The board is composed of all of the elective officers of the executive branch: the Governor as chairman, the lieutenant governor, the secretary of state, the attorney-general, the auditor-general, the treasurer, the superintendent of public instruction, and the highway commissioner.[1] Originally designed to have "general supervisory control over the functions and activities of all administrative departments, boards, commissions, and officers of the

NOTE: This article is based upon a recently published monograph by the authors entitled *The Michigan Department of Administration,* University of Michigan Governmental Studies No. 31 (Ann Arbor: Bureau of Government, Institute of Public Administration, 1956), 146 pp. $3.00.

[1] The lieutenant-governor was not added to the board until 1939.

state, and all state institutions,"[2] the board gradually lost authority over specific functions such as budgeting, accounting, and purchasing; it operates today primarily as a body which is expected by law to approve or disapprove specific actions of other state agencies. It is in this "approval" area that board activities impinge significantly upon the functions of the Department of Administration. In no fewer than ten types of instance, the powers of the department can be exercised only with the approval of the board. In addition, the controller, whose superior is the Governor, is ex officio the secretary of the board.

The Department of Administration was almost the sole product of a broad campaign for administrative reorganization waged by Governor Kim Sigler during his single term in office from 1947 through 1948. The legislative history of the Department of Administration Act shows that the department was created reluctantly by an unenthusiastic Legislature as the price of avoiding a less acceptable kind of administrative reorganization through the constitutional initiative. Many legislators, particularly in the Senate, were firmly opposed to a central management agency responsible solely to the Governor. They succeeded in subordinating the department to the traditional Administrative Board by inserting numerous and ambiguous provisos calling for clearance or approval of department action by the board. The new agency thus had to begin functioning under a cloud of uncertainty about what it could or could not do, and where its responsibility lay.

State Political Climate

As an experiment in central management control, the department has inevitably been affected by the political climate in the state government. The political balance of power in the state has been unstable during the years of the department's existence. This indecisive political balance has conditioned both the external relations and internal operations of the department; hence, its place in the Michigan governmental setting can be depicted only against a background of political developments.

[2] *Michigan Statutes Annotated*, sec. 3.263.

Briefly, the facts are these. In Michigan, the Legislature in recent years has been constantly dominated by the Republican party. Since shortly after the Department of Administration began functioning, the Governorship has been held by a Democrat. The Administrative Board has been divided between Democratic and Republican elected executive officials. Republicans dominated the board during the whole time from 1948 through 1954, the Governor being the lone Democratic member of the board during four years of this period. The pendulum swung in the 1954 general election, giving the Democrats a majority on the board for the first time, as of January 1, 1955.

In 1949, with the inauguration of Governor Williams and the other winning candidates for the offices on the Administrative Board, and the beginning of the legislative session, the department was drawn toward the center of the political stage. The Governor has the power to veto board actions, but may be overridden by five votes. During Governor Williams' first term, covering 1949 and 1950, a vital fact for the Governor and the Department of Administration was that the opposition party possessed exactly enough votes on the Administrative Board to override a Governor's veto of board action and was thus in a position to control the board's decisions, including the conduct of board supervision over the department. This close division of power on the board offered a temptation to make tests of strength out of issues involving the department.

The results of the 1950 general election intensified the political rivalry involving the board and the department. Democratic Governor Williams won reelection by the narrowest of margins. The Republicans recaptured the other two executive offices which had been occupied by Democrats, giving the Republican party possession of all offices on the Administrative Board with the exception of the Governorship itself. The Republicans also maintained top-heavy majorities in each chamber of the Legislature although the Democrats kept barely enough seats in the House of Representatives to sustain a Governor's veto.

In November, 1952, Democratic Governor Williams was reelected, again by a small margin. Republicans were elected to the offices of lieutenant governor, secretary of state,

treasurer, attorney-general, and auditor general. In the spring election of 1953, the incumbent Republican highway commissioner was reelected, and a Republican superintendent of public instruction was elected to succeed the former superintendent who was not a candidate. The Republicans, therefore, continued to hold all of the seats on the Administrative Board with the exception of the Governorship. The November, 1952, elections had continued the heavy Republican majority in the Legislature although by one vote in the house the Democrats could still sustain a gubernatorial veto.

The 1954 general election brought a drastic reversal to this Republican position of dominance on the Administrative Board. The Democrats swept the state ticket, electing Governor Williams for an unprecedented fourth consecutive two-year term, and displacing Republicans in the five other offices on the board which were filled in the election. In the 1955 spring election, this trend was arrested when the Republican incumbent as superintendent of public instruction defeated his Democratic opponent after a very close contest. The line-up on the board after this election stood at six Democrats and two Republicans. The Democrats thus moved swiftly from a minority of one on the eight-member board to a decisive majority, with the next election for officials who serve on the board scheduled for the fall of 1956. Meanwhile, the Republicans were still in control of both houses of the Legislature for the 1955 and 1956 sessions, although by reduced majorities.

Relations between Department and Board

It is therefore plain that both statutory language and political considerations have made it inevitable that the affairs of the department should be closely interwoven with the attitudes and actions of the Administrative Board. The patchwork pattern of Administrative Board approvals over the conduct of functions basically assigned to the department would have presented thorny questions of exact division of authority in any event. When political rivalry and the search for partisan advantage intrude upon purely administrative considerations, the problem of board supervision over department operations becomes complicated and the results are not always in the interest of good administration.

The differences which have arisen in relations between the board and the department have for the most part appeared at three points which will be discussed below: (1) supervision of department activities by board committees; (2) the controller's relationships to the board as its secretary; and (3) disputes concerning the respective jurisdictions of the board and the department.

The Administrative Board prior to 1948 was accustomed to carry out much of its business through committees. When the department was created in 1948, the committee system was retained by the board and the board has continued to exercise its supervision of department activities through several committees.

The effect of the existence of the committees on relations between the department and the board is hard to measure. The retention of committees by the board disappointed some backers of the department, and it showed some reluctance on the part of the board to lean entirely on the department to do its staff work. Opinion concerning the effect of committees on the staff work of the department differs to some extent within the department. What is probably a minority opinion holds that a reasonable amount of scrutiny of the details of administration by the board and its committees has a good effect by keeping the department staff alert. Also, on difficult problems it is sometimes desirable from the department's point of view to have the board take some of the responsibility for a decision.

On the other hand, the majority opinion in the department is less favorable in judging the way board review works. Committee interest is said to show partisan bias and to depend a great deal on the political implications of the business at hand; board members show a tendency to send deputies to committee meetings to review operations of agencies headed by party colleagues of the board majority, but attend themselves when the business involving agencies controlled by the opposite party is under consideration. Committee scrutiny may require unnecessary delay in taking action in ordinary administrative matters and modifica-

tion of the best administrative practice may have to be made because of committee and board desires. The paper work demanded for the conduct of the board business is irksome and expensive, with two secretaries spending full time in preparation of documents for approval, agenda, minutes, and other matters. Much of the time spent on board and committee matters by professional and secretarial staff of the department could be better used in other ways.

Some of the stresses and strains between the board and the department have arisen as a result of the controller's relationship to the board as its secretary and his policy and political relationship to the Governor. Three controllers have been appointed by Democratic Governor Williams, and, as is natural for a policy position of this nature, all three have been Democrats, although none of the three had been very active in party politics prior to appointment. The first of these Williams appointees served for nearly five years, the second for fourteen months, and the third, the present controller, has been serving since January, 1955. The controller appointed by Governor Sigler was a Republican and served for only four months in 1948.

Members of the Administrative Board seem to have accepted the logic of having the controller serve as secretary, and none has advocated removing him from the assignment. However, there has not been complete satisfaction by any means on the part of board members with the performance of the controller as secretary. The first Williams appointee, who served five years, was a favorite target for attack during his tenure. Some board members recognized that as a spokesman for the Governor the controller is inevitably in an awkward position when the board is controlled by officials politically antagonistic to the Governor. Nevertheless, a complaint frequently voiced was that he used his office "as a political weapon" or that he served in it "as a political aid to the Governor." It seems clear that he did not play a passive role as secretary or remain neutral about issues on which the board was divided. However, these rumblings must to some extent be regarded as a symptom of the split in the political composition of the board.

The two subsequent controllers have largely escaped this kind of criticism. In part, this must be due to their shorter tenure. However, to a greater extent it is probably due to their different concept of the controllership and to their conduct of the office. In their relations with the board, as elsewhere, they stressed the management aspects of the position rather than the political role. As a consequence, they appeared to be much less aggressive as secretary of the board.

Each of the numerous areas in which actions of the Department of Administration are subject to approval by the State Administrative Board offers a potential point for dissension between the two agencies. In several instances this smoldering jurisdictional friction has broken into flame; disputes over purchasing matters have been the most prominent. There have been several of these purchasing disputes, and usually voting on the board concerning the disputes has been along party lines.

The Department of Administration Act gives the department power to issue rules and regulations governing the operation of purchasing, subject to approval by the Administrative Board. A set of rules was formulated by the department and presented to the Administrative Board on May 17, 1949.[8] After consideration, the board expressed dissatisfaction with the rules as submitted and sent them back to the department for certain indicated changes. The department made the desired changes and resubmitted the revised rules to the board, on August 2, 1949. However, a subsequent dispute between the Department of Administration and the Highway Department changed the atmosphere in which consideration of the rules took place. On a vote strictly along party lines, by a 5 to 3 margin, the board adopted significant amendments to the proposed rules.

The controller declined to accept Administrative Board amendments to the rules. He

[8] At that time no rules governing purchasing were in effect. The Administrative Board had adopted a set of purchasing rules in 1943, but these had never been approved by the attorney general as required by *Mich. Public Acts* (1943), No. 88, and the attorney general therefore held that they were no longer applicable. Opinion No. 1037, August 12, 1949, in *Biennial Report of the Attorney General of Michigan, July 1, 1948 to June 30, 1950*, p. 310.

contended that the board had only the power of approval of the rules, and that this term should not be interpreted to mean revision. The approval power under this view permits only acceptance or rejection of the rules proposed by the department, and not revision and subsequent adoption of the revised rules. As a result, no purchasing rules were ever put into effect, and the matter reached a permanent stalemate, with the board being able to block rules drafted by the department which were not to the board's liking, but unable to promulgate rules of its own. As a substitute for formal purchasing rules, late in 1950 the Department of Administration issued a manual of purchasing procedures which serves to guide the agencies in their purchasing activities, so that the lack of formal rules has made little difference.

There has also been considerable difference of opinion between the department and the board about the proper procedure for control of agency allotments, the board having the statutory responsibility, through the Budget Division, to make allotments. Until 1950, allotment control was entirely a Budget Division function.[4] Although the board had not formally delegated its responsibility to the Budget Division, the board had permitted the division to perform this function without interference.

Appropriations for the fiscal year 1950-51 were considerably lower than had been requested by the agencies and by the Governor. The Legislature, through appropriation language, and the Governor, through directives, attempted to prevent the agencies from exceeding their appropriations. The Administrative Board then issued a "Statement of Policy" which required that "all proposed periodic allotments of funds appropriated to the several departments, agencies, and institutions of the government of this state for the fiscal year 1950-51 will be submitted to this Board by the Controller through the Finance and Claims Committee, and no such allotments shall be effective until approved by this Board."[5] This was apparently done to reassert actual control over allotments by the board.

The controller then in effect refused to assume responsibility for recommending allotments to the board, and merely transmitted agency requests to the board for action. The board and its Finance and Claims Committee, being ill-equipped to evaluate these requests, usually approved allotments as requested by the agencies. The results were not very satisfactory, and by the fiscal year 1951-52, the allotment procedure was back on substantially the same basis as before, with major reliance for consideration of agency requests and for the making of allotment decisions placed on the Budget Division.

The Budget Division and the board have differed on the period for which allotments should be made. Not until August 7, 1951, did the board consent to change allotments to a quarterly rather than a monthly basis.[6] The board permitted the change to the quarterly system on condition that: (1) overruns of allotments in one quarter be made up in the next; (2) the controller submit a report to the board each quarter showing that the agencies have conformed to the allotment schedules; and (3) the controller report to the board each month on any "unusual" variations from monthly amounts shown on the schedules. The board's Finance and Claims Committee, which took the action on the quarterly procedure, stated that any agency which deviated from the quarterly procedure or from the monthly schedule within the quarterly allotments, would be subject to prompt return to monthly allotments. In practice this has not been enforced, however.

Evaluation

The review powers of the State Administrative Board make up the most serious obstacle to the effective operation of the Department of Administration as an aid to the Governor. This problem is intimately tied up with

[4] The view of the Department of Administration on the extent of its control is shown by the following quotation from p. 16 of the department's report of March, 1950: "The Budget Division continues to exercise complete control over allotment of funds and all matters pertaining to allotments are cleared through the Division."

[5] *Budget Memorandum No. 14* (Lansing: Budget Division, Department of Administration, June 14, 1950), p. 1.

[6] See *Budget Memorandum No. 31* (Lansing: Budget Division, Department of Administration, August 14, 1951).

the broader question of the multiple executive idea which underlies the board system. It is the consensus of a series of reorganization reports, the latest being the 1951 staff report of the Joint Legislative Committee on Reorganization of Michigan State Government, that the Administrative Board should be abolished. This opinion has been shared by several past Governors and other elective officeholders and is probably the correct view. But it is not the purpose here to deal extensively with the broad question of board competency and usefulness.

The concern here is with the effect of the statutory review and approval powers—both directly, on the operation of the department, and indirectly, on the relationship of the department to the Governor. The legislative history of the Department of Administration Act leaves no doubt that these provisions were added as a means of curbing the new department by diluting its powers and weakening its responsibilities to the Governor. In practice, the review function has proved burdensome but not unworkable. Ordinarily, approval of department actions is forthcoming, and the main drawback is delay and repetitive paper work. In the event of unreconcilable differences of opinion between the two agencies, as in the dispute over purchasing rules, the department has been able to prevail by simply avoiding action requiring board approval. The work load of board business is considerable, requiring not only a large share of the time of the controller as secretary to the board, but the attention of division chiefs and subordinate officials as well, particularly in the Budget Division. This diversion of energies might be worth while if there were reason to think board scrutiny and approval produced positive results. As a matter of fact, the board is ill equipped to do this sort of supervision. Members, except for the lieutenant governor, have full-time jobs as heads of executive departments and cannot concentrate attention on the problems of administrative management dealt with by the department. Few board members have the technical skills necessary in order to pass judgment on a multitude of technical matters.

The only kind of supervision that the board is really interested in, or equipped to provide, is supervision which is political in purpose and effect. The consequences of board intervention are much more apt to be of political significance than of administrative assistance. The board provides an agency which can be used by one party against the Governor of the opposite party. Even when the board majority is of the same party as the Governor, there is no guarantee of harmony, because some of the board members may be potential or actual rivals of the incumbent for the office of Governor. In either case, the temptation is great to involve Department of Administration business in political contests of power.

Inclusion of the approval and supervisory powers in the act has created an unnecessary arena for partisan political warfare. The straight party voting on the board on nearly every one of the jurisdictional disputes seems to indicate that the controversies were basically partisan in nature. Alternative administrative techniques were not in question in most of the disputes. Whereas formerly the board as a group—prior to the creation of the department —was clearly responsible for certain state administrative affairs, the board now has a scapegoat in the department, which may be used as a political weapon against the Governor. On the other hand, there is every opportunity for the Governor to use any disputes between the board and the department as ammunition for political warfare. This particular political arena is not necessary to good government in Michigan. The best interests of the electorate and the Legislature are not served when it is possible for the board and the Governor to foment partisan disputes in this way. Abolition of the State Administrative Board would be a basic solution to this problem. If the board is retained, it should be removed from supervision over activities which are the primary responsibility, by statute, of the Department of Administration.

If the department is to be evaluated primarily as an aid to the Governor, the direct relationships between the Governor and the department are of utmost significance. The focus of interest here is on the Governor's attitudes and expectations concerning the controller and the Budget Division particularly, and concerning other units of the department to a lesser extent. Since the department is conceived of as a managerial agency, presumably it should

be used by the Governor for management purposes rather than as an instrument of political action. The department in turn should regard itself as a management improvement agency rather than as a political agent of the incumbent Governor. That the line between "politics" and "administration" is no more clear cut here than elsewhere, however, is evident in the brief history of the department.

Governors must and should be politically oriented. Their main interest is in substantive matters of public policy—and the next election. Considerations of administrative management and improvement are secondary and peripheral. Much more important are issues of fiscal policy which have a direct bearing on the scope and content of policy programs. This scale of interests has been reflected in the record of relations between the department and the Governor. While regarding the department as a useful device and protecting its operating integrity, the Governor has shown most concern with departmental activities such as budgeting, which impinge most directly on policy matters. During campaigns and other periods of heavy political activity, even these activities must compete for his attention and often are put aside.

To sum up, the Governor is not only a chief administrative officer; he is also, and in the first instance, the elected political leader of the state. He will benefit as chief administrator from the help that he receives from the central management agency. Indirectly, his political reputation will be helped by a good record as an administrator. His political career is much more apt to depend, however, on his performance in other areas. The political scene is the Governor's abiding concern. Concentration on management problems tends to be spasmodic and irregular. The contribution which can be made by the Department of Administration is to provide continuous attention to state administrative management on behalf of the Governor when he is occupied elsewhere, and to respond promptly when the Governor needs help as the top-ranking administrator in state government.

In order to function effectively, it seems to us that the controller and the staff members of the department must endeavor to maintain loyalty to the policy positions and administrative directives of the Governor, while at the same time avoiding, as much as possible, embroilment in political controversies. We have already discussed the effect of Administrative Board clearances in pulling the department into the political arena unnecessarily. Another factor in the effective functioning of the department is the attitude of the controller toward his role in state government. If he identifies himself openly and ardently as an advocate of the Governor's program objectives and thus becomes himself a target of political attack, this may be to the detriment of the department as an effective management agency. There can be no hard and fast rules of conduct here, but our opinion is that the controller is well advised to refrain if possible from becoming a political symbol and to concentrate on his nonpartisan job of improving the standards of state administration. In the last analysis, it is the personal working relationship between the Governor and his controller that sets the tone for the department. Our view is that the Department of Administration will be most valuable to the Governor if both officials stress the housekeeping or management assignment of the department.

This does not mean that the controller and the department do not have important political roles to play. Depending somewhat upon the talents of the controller and the degree of intimacy of his knowledge of state politics, he may become one of the Governor's chief political advisers, and in this role may be bolstered by the staff services available in the department. His services can be of help to the Governor in policy formulation, in compilation of adequate data, through prevention of errors which might embarrass him, and also through discovering the fallacies in the arguments of his political opponents. The controller cannot reasonably aspire, however, to become an "assistant governor." He must be content with relative anonymity, and he must stress, at least overtly, the professional and business management aspects of his job rather than its political overtones.

In examining the legislative origins of the department, we found that it was created by a reluctant Legislature as the result of a political compromise with Governor Sigler. To an extent difficult to measure, the original reluc-

tance to create the department has become a reluctance on the part of the Legislature to acknowledge fully that the department is a useful device. At the root of this attitude—it does not pervade the whole Legislature—is the political division between the Governorship and the Legislature.

Partly as a result of the division between the Governorship and the Legislature, there are strained relations between the Budget Division and the Legislature. The Legislature has kept an exceptionally tight rein on the operating funds and staff of the Budget Division. In part, this has resulted from personality differences, but the Legislature as a whole has, nevertheless, consented to stringent appropriations for the division. As much as anything else, the Legislature's tight rein on the division is the result of a general frustration in the process of budget enactment. The Legislature is unsure of its role in the process, yet extremely conscious of its power over the public purse and reluctant to give up any of its power.

The presentation of the Governor's program to the Legislature in the budget should be the signal for the most important political debate of the legislative session. The policy points of view presented in the Governor's budget should be fully debated in the Legislature on the basis of informed opinion. However, the Legislature does not have adequate technical staff to assist in analyzing the Governor's budget and this lack has contributed to the Legislature's frustration and its strained relations with the Budget Division.

The department has had to develop its technical housekeeping functions while adapting itself as well as possible to an indifferent or even hostile political environment. It has grown to maturity under conditions which have at times threatened its very existence. More than once, prominent legislators have castigated it vehemently, advocated its abolition, and introduced bills to terminate it or drastically curtail its scope of operations. Barring unforeseen developments, however, the department now seems to be secure against annihilation by statute, although it can expect continued harassment from the Legislature and other quarters.

Despite the tense political atmosphere in which it has had to operate, the Michigan Department of Administration has demonstrated the gains in state administrative practices which can be made, even under exceptionally trying conditions, by such a central management agency. In addition, the department has substantially succeeded in furnishing to the chief executive needed instruments of direction and control of the administrative machinery. The record of the Michigan department can be taken as an encouragement by other states which have created similar agencies or contemplate doing so.

The New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Methods and Procedures, 1947-1956

By SAMUEL L. KESSLER

Associate Examiner of Methods and Procedures
New York State Conservation Department

"WHOEVER pursues a business in this world must have a system. A business which has attained success without a system does not exist. From ministers and generals down to the hundreds of craftsmen, every one of them has a system. The craftsmen employ the ruler to make a square and the compass to make a circle. All of them, both skilled and unskilled, use this system. The skilled may at times accomplish a circle and a square by their own dexterity. But with a system, even the unskilled may achieve the same result, although dexterity they have none. Hence, every craftsman possesses a system as a model. Now, if we govern the empire, or a large state, without a system as a model, are we not even less intelligent than a common craftsman?"[1]

Until fairly recently, administrative planning was carried out as one of the manifold duties of top administrative officials and their assistants. New York State was among the first governmental jurisdictions in the United States to recognize the possibilities in scientific management and to create, within the departments of government, staff units charged solely with the function of administrative planning.

The first agency in New York State to organize an administrative planning unit was the State Insurance Fund, in 1935. Similar units were created in the Department of Social Welfare in 1937, the Division of Employment in 1939, the Workmen's Compensation Board in 1945, the Division of the Budget in 1946, the Department of Health in 1946, the Department of Taxation and Finance in 1947, and the Department of Civil Service in 1949. Since 1949, administrative planning units have been installed in the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, the State University of New York, the Department of Audit and Control, the State Thruway Authority, the Department of Mental Hygiene, the Department of Public Works, and the Conservation Department. Today there are sixteen such units in state agencies. With nineteen state departments and scores of boards, commissions, and authorities in the governmental structure, it is probable that more and more administrative planning units will evolve in the state as evidence of their creative accomplishments continues to spread.

These administrative planning units are designed to function in the same way as do management consultants in private industry. Each serves as a staff arm of the chief administrative officer of the agency, maintaining a continuous review of the agency's organization structure, policies, operating procedures, management reports, and forms and identifying and assisting in the solution of problems in those areas. Space does not permit detailing the many remarkable achievements of these units in their respective agencies. They have become individually a tremendous force for the extension of modern administrative techniques through-

NOTE: The author acknowledges the generous assistance of the members of the Interdepartmental Committee on Methods and Procedures, many of whom made their files available to him, and Professor Phillips Bradley of Syracuse University.

[1] *Works of Micius.* Quoted in Kuo-Cheng Wu, *Ancient Chinese Political Theories* (The Commercial Press, 1928), p. 226.

out their organizations, and have saved the taxpayers of the state untold millions of dollars. But it is their collective activity which concerns us in this article.

Organization and History

By early 1947 there were seven administrative planning units in agencies of the state government. There were five in Albany which were actively engaged in administrative planning work, one in Albany which was relatively inactive, and one in New York City. The heads of the five active units in Albany—William Arnstein of the Division of the Budget, Karel Ficek of the Division of Employment, Murray Nathan of the Department of Health, Ellis Riker of the Department of Taxation and Finance, and F. L. Forno of the Workmen's Compensation Board—had much in common; all but Mr. Arnstein had begun their administrative planning careers in the Division of Employment, and had developed uniform techniques in performing methods and procedures work. Mr. Arnstein had worked closely with all of them and had assisted in the formation of the planning units of the various agencies into which these "graduates" from the Division of Employment were recruited. Because of this common heritage, these five planning unit heads frequently discussed individual and mutual problems and exchanged advice and help freely. They were just beginning to consider the possible advantages of formalizing their union of talents when a most fortuitous circumstance occurred.

John Burton, then state budget director, had just returned from a visit to Europe where he had attended an international conference on scientific management. While in Europe he had observed with favor the excellent strides being made in governmental adaptation of scientific management principles, particularly in Sweden and Great Britain. Shortly after his return to Albany, at a luncheon meeting with Messrs. Arnstein, Ficek, Forno, Nathan, and Riker, Mr. Burton broached the subject of an interdepartmental committee of planning unit heads and, under his sponsorship, the Interdepartmental Committee on Methods and Procedures was born. The first meeting took place on August 21, 1947, when the group met to organize for an "interchange of ideas and knowledge pertaining to administrative management in general and more particularly organization and methods," and for "the stimulation of research in methods."[2]

Until June 8, 1951, the committee held meetings and conducted business in an informal way; Murray Nathan acted as secretary, recording minutes of meetings and developing agendas in consultation with the other members. However, by that time, the committee had grown to a membership of twelve planning unit heads, and the need was felt to formalize its proceedings to keep pace with its increased size and activities. Accordingly, the members agreed to elect a chairman and secretary for the 1951-52 year. The first officers elected by the committee were William Arnstein, then chief of the Administrative Management Unit of the Division of the Budget, as chairman, and Karel Ficek, director of planning of the Division of Employment, as secretary. The first chairman appointed a Committee on Rules and Procedures to draft rules to guide the activities of the committee, and a Program Committee charged with the responsibility of planning a program of activities for the 1951-52 year. It was agreed, beginning with the first formal meeting of June 8, 1951, that official minutes of each meeting were to be prepared, reflecting the matters discussed, the activities undertaken, and the accomplishments achieved. The secretary was charged with the responsibility for taking and transcribing the minutes and distributing them to all members.

The 1952-53 officers were Karel Ficek, chairman, and Stanley Kollin, secretary. The officers for 1953-54 were Murray Nathan, chairman, and Milton Lewis, secretary; for 1954-55, Ellis Riker, chairman, and Milton Lewis, secretary; for 1955-56, Edward O'Connell, chairman, and Robert McAmmond, secretary. There is an unwritten rule that the chairman of the committee shall be selected from among the planning unit heads according to the chronological sequence in which their units were organized. The secretary is elected without such considerations, and may succeed himself from one year to the next if it is the will of the group.

---

[2] Minutes of Meeting of August 21, 1947; also Rules of the Interdepartmental Committee on Methods and Procedures, Adopted May 19, 1952.

Today, the committee has sixteen members and has expanded the scope of its activities into more and more fields. Its usefulness as an instrument of state government has increased manifold in its brief history, and the future holds many challenges for even greater service to the State of New York.

Activities and Achievements

At its first meeting on August 21, 1947, the group agreed to undertake the following projects:

1. The establishment of a catalog of office machines and business aids with as full a history of specifications and accomplishments as could be obtained both from the manufacturer and from experience with the use of these machines.
2. Regular joint visits to the annual business shows and other exhibitions of office machines and business aids.
3. Joint visits to large companies having organization and methods departments.
4. A joint visit to the State Library to become acquainted with the collection of books, periodicals, etc., in the general field of administrative management and, more particularly, organization and methods.
5. The establishment of complete library materials in the fields indicated and such library services as the preparation and circulation of a list of accessions on perhaps a monthly basis and the preparation of limited research papers.[3]

Probably one of the foremost achievements of the committee, and the one most difficult to illustrate with concrete accomplishments, is the day-to-day and month-to-month mutual exchange of ideas, advice on equipment and techniques, and assistance in solving problems and the general mutual aid in which all the members freely participate. Most of the other identifiable accomplishments stem from this facet of the committee's activities.

Standard Nomenclature and Practices. An important contribution of the committee has been the steady development of uniform language and practices among the several administrative planning units, and through them the state agencies they serve, as well as other state agencies which have accepted these principles. The committee studied many standard glossaries of administrative terminology and developed and obtained general acceptance of its own glossary, a brief list of definitions of words used in administration which had not been employed consistently in the state's official writings. Agreement by the several administrative planning units and their agencies to use these standard terms has enabled the various administrators to release directives, memorandums, manuals of procedures, forms, and other written materials with a greater certainty of being understood.

The committee has also formulated a standard nomenclature for the various levels of departmental subdivisions which has gained acceptance in most state agencies. Organizational subdivisions in the following descending sequence were recognized: department, division, bureau, section, and unit; subdivisions of a unit could be designated subunit, stenographic pool, files, or similar descriptive name. It was further agreed that large agencies could insert intermediary levels into their organizational plans; for example, "office" between the bureau and the section, or "subsection" between the section and the unit. However, such insertions were not to be used in place of any of the standard subdivisions listed above, nor could the sequence of such subdivisions be changed.

Another effort at uniformity was the development of a standard statement of the functions assigned to an administrative planning unit. Recognizing that the units differed in size, scope of operations, and salary levels of their heads, this standard statement of functions could serve only as a guide. Each administrative planning unit could adapt part of the standard statement to its own operations, while considering the complete statement of functions as its goal in developing and expanding its operations. The standard statement includes some fourteen functions under the four headings of developmental functions, survey and review functions, coordinating functions, and advisory and service functions.

Other efforts to establish uniform practices have included the development of standard "duty statements" for each position in which personnel are employed in the professional work of administrative planning units. These "duty statements" set forth the duties and responsibilities of a director of planning, a prin-

[3] Minutes of Meeting of August 21, 1947.

cipal examiner of methods and procedures, an associate examiner of methods and procedures, a senior examiner of methods and procedures, an assistant examiner of methods and procedures, and a junior examiner of methods and procedures. The committee has met several times with representatives of the Department of Civil Service to attempt to reach an accord on such duty descriptions, to offer advice on the qualifications needed for positions at the various levels, and to suggest the best means of recruitment for appointment and promotion to positions in this field. Some members of the committee have assisted in the development of civil service examinations for these positions.

Improvement of Staffs of Administrative Planning Units. The committee has been concerned since its inception with the training and improvement of the staff members of the various administrative planning units. It has encouraged manufacturers of office equipment and business machines to give demonstrations in Albany for these staff members and for operating personnel. The equipment demonstrations have proved relatively simple to organize. Many manufacturers have gone all out to bring a variety of equipment to Albany and to send representatives to lecture on potential applications of their equipment in government operations. In addition, most of the planning units have sent one or more staff members annually to the National Business Show in New York to keep them up to date on new developments in office equipment and machines. The committee has conducted field trips for its members to visit such places as the Ozalid Manufacturing plant in Johnson City, the IBM plant in Endicott, and the Methods and Procedures Department of the General Electric Company in Schenectady.

The committee's strong interest in training led it to initiate, in March, 1948, a program intended to give state employees an opportunity to qualify for methods and procedures work. At the suggestion of the committee, the Department of Civil Service worked out an Administrative Analysis Institute to be given by New York University staff instructors in Albany and New York City to candidates carefully screened by a difficult aptitude test. Of 771 employees throughout the state who competed in this screening test, 129 passed; of these, 96 were nominated by their department heads for admission to the course. The institute was conducted early in 1949. Of the 96 participants, 80 completed the institute (two weeks of full-time instruction), 15 failed, and 1 dropped out. Of the 80 successful participants, 35 were admitted to the state civil service examination for Junior Examiner of Methods and Procedures, of whom 12 passed; 60 were admitted to the examination for Assistant Examiner of Methods and Procedures, of whom 23 passed. (A number of persons competed in both examinations.)

The committee has sponsored other training programs for the staffs of the various units. Recently it arranged for one of the country's leading forms designers to give a four-day seminar on Forms Design and Paperwork Simplification to which all staff members were invited. Currently, the committee is sponsoring the writing of a complete handbook on administrative analysis tools and techniques to be distributed to all staff members of administrative planning units. Each committee member has been assigned to write one chapter of this handbook and to maintain the section he writes by issuing necessary revisions from time to time.

Purchasing of Office Machines and Equipment. A major activity of the committee has revolved around its interest in state procedures in purchasing office machines and equipment. In November, 1951, the chairman designated a Sub-Committee on Equipment which was given, as its first assignment, the arrangement of a series of meetings with representatives of the State Division of Standards and Purchase to discuss common problems in this field. The subcommittee met first with Deputy Commissioner Charles J. Gimbrone, of the State Division of Standards and Purchase, who described the functions of his division and the laws under which the division operates.

The committee subsequently recommended that each agency represented among its members should refer purchasing problems to the Sub-Committee on Equipment for review with the Division of Standards and Purchase. The committee further suggested that purchasing personnel of the agencies should meet periodically with the Division of Standards and Pur-

chase to exchange ideas and to work out mutual problems. As a last recommendation, the committee suggested that the Division of Standards and Purchase set up an administrative planning unit of its own.

Annual Clambake. Lest it appear that the activities of the committee have been only on the serious side, it should be reported that the group started the custom of getting together all the professional, stenographic, and clerical personnel working in administrative planning units for a clambake each fall. These gatherings have enabled the professional and clerical people in the various planning offices to become better acquainted over the years, and while their purpose has been purely social, the gain for methods and procedures work in the state service has been considerable. These outings have fostered good personal relationships among staffs of the units, and the inevitable interchange of ideas among hardy "shop-talkers" whose enthusiasm for their subject even a clambake cannot dim for long.

Other Accomplishments. Other things that the interdepartmental committee has done in its brief existence should be mentioned:

1. It has stimulated the vast State Library in Albany to build up its collection of publications and documents in the field of administrative management and related disciplines.

2. It has developed in its members and their staffs a high degree of professionalization.

3. It has assisted in the development of uniform records management procedures among state agencies.

4. It has assisted in the resolution of disagreements between agencies and in developing uniform procedures for similar activities of various agencies.

5. It has arranged "loans" from agencies having certain machines and equipment to agencies needing such equipment for occasional use.

6. It has steadily expanded the boundaries of administrative planning work and has helped to foster the best concepts of planning, work simplification, and forms design among top management and middle management staffs.

7. Its members have participated in the activities of many professional organizations, such as the Systems and Procedures Association, the National Office Management Association, the Society for the Advancement of Management, the American Society for Public Administration, and the Civil Service Assembly. Such participation has involved joining the organizations and their local chapters, participating in national meetings of the organizations, furnishing speakers to address local chapters, and subscribing to the publications of the organizations.

8. It has not only been a useful organ of interdepartmental cooperation, but has pointed the way for the practitioners in other fields. The road has been charted for purchasing officials, for finance officers, and for other specialists to work together for their mutual advantage. The personnel officers of the various state agencies have already had such interdepartmental collaboration for several years, under the leadership of the Department of Civil Service.

9. It has successfully stimulated the installation of administrative planning units in state agencies large enough to be able to profit from them. The increase from five to sixteen planning units in nine years is a tribute to the manner in which the gospel has spread. The committee will undoubtedly continue its missionary work until it will be as common for any agency to have an administrative planning unit as it is for it to have a personnel office.

On Being an Intern—and Afterward

By GLENN G. MORGAN

THE Third Career Development Program for Administrative Officers, administered by the United States Civil Service Commission, was held in Washington, D. C., from February 1 to June 25, 1954. The stated purpose of the program was to "broaden the experience and competence of outstanding career employees in areas of general administration." The program went beyond the bounds of the Junior Management Assistant program and selected persons employed by the government in the area of "middle management" for intensive training which would enable them to hold more responsible positions as higher executives in the government service. Participation in the program was limited to federal employees in grades GS-9 through GS-12. After successfully qualifying in a written examination and group interviews, twenty interns, all men, representing eleven agencies from the U.S. and the Panama Canal Zone, were chosen to participate in the program.

The training course consisted of several elements: a two-week orientation period; rotating work assignments; a research project in one of the work assignments which was to culminate in a project thesis; group discussion and formal academic work; periodic appraisals of the intern's progress by and with the program director; and other activities such as outside reading, participation in agency management meetings, field trips, and attendance at meetings of local professional societies in the field of management.

Having read the description of the program circulated throughout my agency, I decided to apply. I was a research analyst in the National Security Agency, engaged in classified social science research, and thought the program sounded like a good way in which to acquire additional knowledge to prepare me for higher supervisory jobs. Working in only a segment of my agency, I had not had an opportunity to learn much about operations elsewhere either in my agency or in other agencies of the federal government. As a graduate student in political science, I had, of course, studied the formal structure and functioning of the various governmental units, but this is a far cry from contact with the daily operational problems which confront the civil servant. The diary of my progress during the Third Career Development Program will indicate how one person was affected by, and reacted to, training in management.

19 Dec. '53—Took the written exam for the management program today. The general part was not bad, but those questions on administration! Now how would I have the slightest idea about relations between the central and the field office? And those hypothetical problems about handling employee relations; I get paid to turn out technical information, not act as Dale Carnegie. I wonder if any of the other fellows knew any of those answers.

28 Dec. '53—Well, I passed! I must be a better guesser than I thought. I can see that I am going to have a lot of explaining to do in my branch about the program. Today, Miss M., the supervisor down the aisle, exclaimed, "But I didn't know you were interested in *administration!* I thought you wanted to be a researcher, not take care of time cards, payroll records, order supplies, and that sort of thing. And you with your Ph.D. almost completed. What a pity!" Tried to convince her that I wanted to learn more about the *management* of research, but doubt if she is convinced.

4 Jan. '54—Had my oral interview today down at the Civil Service Commission. I sure must have shown my ignorance of administrative procedures. If you are not a supervisor you don't have any practice in relations with other units, the division office, or all sorts of routine requirements. Felt I answered up pretty well,

but maybe a researcher doesn't belong in this program.

15 Jan. '54—We're in! Got a call from Newman L. in the Training Office to tell me I had been selected (first time I even knew we had a Training Office). That schedule they sent over certainly looks comprehensive, with all of those meetings, reports, and assignments coming up. That reading list will really keep me busy. Just getting through the Brownlow *Report* and the Hoover Commission *Reports* should take all my time before the program starts. Boy, it's going to be great to see the other side of the fence!

1 Feb. '54—Had our first meeting of the orientation today, and it was great! The program director is really an old hand at this government business and he gave us a good talk on the federal government. Then Frank Brassor in the afternoon on the work of the Hoover Commission. Most of the other fellows seem to know a lot more about general administration than I do, judging from their questions and statements.

7 Feb. '54—Now that was really a wonderful week! That talk by John Macy was good, and Fritz M. Marx just had us in the palm of his hand. Never thought a discussion on budgeting could be so interesting. Signed up for a course on Problems of Governmental Reorganization at American University; sounded general enough. Most of the other courses seemed too specialized for my needs. The four interns from my agency had a talk with Dr. J., our agency adviser, about work assignments. Sure wish I knew more about the agency so as to know where would be the best place to go.

8 Feb. '54—This week is getting off to a good start also. Had a presentation this morning on theory of organization, and one on work simplification this afternoon. All that reading doesn't leave me a minute.

9 Feb. '54—Most interesting talk this afternoon on the National Archives by Herbert Angel. Supposed to have a talk on fiscal management tomorrow. All this "staff" work is interesting, but what does it have to do with my plans as a researcher? The program director assures me that I should aim toward assignments for training in the management of research. I hope I can; I don't particularly care to become a budget analyst. This "administrative generalist" concept sounds good, but how can you supervise others if you don't know an awful lot about the work they are doing?

12 Feb. '54—Well, we finished the orientation today. That discussion by Bill Oncken on human relations and personnel problems was a riot, but there was a lot of good meat underneath. Glad we got to talk to the former interns yesterday about work assignments and project theses. We all seem to feel the same way: lost and unsure of where we are going. Had to turn in a statement of my career objectives for the next five years, but outside of wanting to rise from an individual researcher to a research supervisor I am not too sure of where I am going. Had another conference with Dr. J. today, and I asked that we be given an orientation of our own agency, so that we might get some ideas of where our work assignments might be most profitably carried out. Sure wish we were not the first from our agency in this program, so we might have some ideas from previous interns.

14 Feb. '54—End of the orientation; it was really intensive. The change from my previous work was sure exhilarating, and I dread to think of going back to the same old job now. "Scientific management" is the greatest! Just think of all my fellow workers going on their humdrum way without having heard any of this. I hope I can come up with a work plan next week for the rest of the program.

15 Feb. '54—We are getting somewhere. Spent all day being briefed on the organization and functions of my agency. The agency adviser did a good job and brought in several competent speakers to give us an idea of what goes on around here. I now know that we have a Comptroller's Office! That seems to be a good place in which to learn about management in the agency. I'll ask Dr. J. if he can contact somebody over there for me to see about getting a work assignment in that area.

16 Feb. '54—Had a talk with the comptroller himself today and he was most interested in my program. After a conference with the chief of the Programs Review Branch, we decided that I might spend a profitable six weeks in there on the Reports Coordination Program. I

could help in setting up a reports control program in Production, the part of the agency from which I had originally come. Sure is a lot of talk about management over here!

17 Feb. '54—I would sort of like to get over to the Department of State and see how they handle research problems. Dr. J. called a friend in the Office of Intelligence Research today and got an appointment for me to talk to them tomorrow about a work assignment there. I still don't have the slightest idea of where I am going to do a project thesis or on what.

18 Feb. '54—Well, it is sort of indefinite, but I guess I will be able to put in six weeks at State. Dr. E., head of OIR, was surprised that I would come all the way down there just to study *administration,* saying he would have thought that we had personnel and budget people in our place. I assured him that I wanted to study the conduct of research in his organization, not the peripheral service functions. He passed me on to Jim E., head of the Planning Staff, who figured I might be able to do him and myself a service by studying the consumer relationships involved in intelligence production. We will work this out in greater detail when I show up in six weeks.

19 Feb. '54—Now I am really stumped! Six weeks to fill in and don't know where to go. Saved by Dr. D., who suggested I go see Charlie T., head of the Production Coordinating Group, handling relations with consumers who receive our material. He agreed to take me on for six weeks and said he had a project in mind on which I could work.

26 Feb. '54—Turned in my first progress report today to the new program director. He apparently wanted more comments on each individual speaker we had during the orientation than I gave.

28 Feb. '54—Guess I am all ready to begin my work assignment in the Comptroller's Office tomorrow. Will be working with Harry Smith on reports control. Hope I get some ideas fast on a project thesis for an "installed management improvement." Started class at American University this past week and it looks as if it is going to be very interesting and useful. Last night several of us went down to the meeting of the Society for the Advancement of Management, at which John Corson spoke on the problem of securing executives for the federal service. I hope the rest of the professional society meetings are as good, but the ones listed certainly look technical.

1 Mar. '54—Had a busy day today. Met everybody in the Programs Review Branch and got to work studying reports control in my agency and in other agencies. Also got to look over the charts and graphs of activities of the agency. Everybody was most friendly, and I have complete access to all the files.

2 Mar. '54—Talked with Harry about setting up a reports control program in Production; they want somebody over there now to assist them. Believe I will go over next week. Attended the comptroller's staff meeting today. Nothing very exciting was discussed, but it gave me an idea of what problems they have and how they go about solving them. Also talked to Tom S. about the Management Improvement Program in the Department of Defense.

3 Mar. '54—We had our first Wednesday evening seminar tonight; it's to be a regular part of the intern program. We organized ourselves into a group and elected officers. I can see now that this is going to be work, coming down there to the Civil Service Commission building after a hard day.

7 Mar. '54—Well, the first week of the work assignment is over. Sure have learned a lot about reports control, forms control, management engineering, work measurement, incentives award program, etc. Wish I had a little more direction, though.

10 Mar. '54—Yesterday Harry and I talked with the woman in Production who is to be charged with reports control there; she wants me to come over there soon, and I might as well, as I have read about everything on the subject in the Comptroller's Office. Also, it will be nice actually to get to work on something.

14 Mar. '54—That three-day Management Conference the agency put on was sort of interesting, although several of the speakers had already addressed us during the orientation period. I thought those movies on human relations were excellent, giving a real-life presentation of how a person affects his subordinates.

Off to fame and fortune in Production tomorrow!

15 Mar. '54—Jean and I arranged to have the reports control program transferred to the Administrative Planning Group. We also attended a big meeting on operations analysis, where plans were made to analyze statistically all the agency's operations. There are so many people jammed into our office that I can only sit down when somebody is out for the day!

17 Mar. '54—We had our second speaker for the Wednesday night seminar. Very difficult to stay awake and concentrate on position classification and salary administration after an exhausting day in the mill. And all the professional society meetings coming up are so technical, dealing with quality control, logistics planning, standardization, materials handling, etc.

24 Mar. '54—That was a trying week. We have decided that we must take an inventory of the reports in Production, but do not know how to go about it. Jean is disappointed that I do not know more about the subject than I do, thinking that the Comptroller's Office was going to send over somebody well versed in reports control. I learned a great deal about Production's activities at least, reading many reports and memos.

26 Mar. '54—The situation is becoming very difficult here. Friction is developing between Production and the Comptroller's Office over the course and nature of the reports control program in Production, and I am caught in the middle. Doesn't look as though I am going to get a project thesis out of reports control, although I have already submitted an outline to the program director.

28 Mar. '54—It is evident that the reports control program is in for a long development, and a comprehensive inventory must be the first step. However, as I don't see a really profitable work assignment shaping up here, will go talk to the OIR people about shifting over there soon. Hope I can get a project thesis lined up over in State.

2 Apr. '54—Things went along very smoothly today. Jim E. gave me the previous management surveys which had been made of OIR, including the Hoover Commission *Report*. Tomorrow we will figure out just how I will try to find out about the relationships between the research analysts in OIR and their consumers.

3 Apr. '54—We decided that it would be wise for me to operate out of the office of the current intelligence officer, for if I contacted the analysts as a representative of the administrative office, they would probably not pay much attention to me! First, however, I shall tour OIR's operations for a week to familiarize myself with them.

10 Apr. '54—I am really set up in business now. Selected twenty-four reports prepared by OIR analysts in a two-week period and will interview the analysts who worked on them in an effort to determine under what circumstances the reports were initiated, the extent of operations in response to request, analysts' awareness of consumer needs, their contact with consumers, consumer reaction to reports, and analysts' awareness of the nature of the distribution of the reports.

14 Apr. '54—We had a very good seminar tonight. Dr. Ralph B. Bennett, technical director of the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, spoke on "Stimulating the Will to Create among Scientific Personnel." He impressed me very much, as I have been thinking about the problem of stimulating latent abilities in persons in my own line of work.

18 Apr. '54—Things are coming along fairly smoothly. My interviews are quite productive, and I am getting a lot of frank statements. Am finding that it helps my work to have an advanced degree in political science, for the analysts unburden themselves better when they discover I also am a researcher and not just another "staff-Johnny." Yesterday, I sat in on a staff meeting of the head of OIR and his division chiefs. Tomorrow I am getting a tour of the External Research Staff. Hope to sit in on a debriefing of a Foreign Service officer just back from India.

25 Apr. '54—Just a few more reports on which to obtain interviews. This project will certainly give me a project thesis. However, I will be glad to get back to my own agency, as I am getting tired of being an outsider.

1 May '54—My interviews are all completed and I must put my findings together into a re-

port. Some very interesting revelations, such as the fact that knowledge about consumer needs seems to vary directly with the grade level of the analyst. I really felt at home in this sort of survey, talking with researchers on operational problems I was familiar with, rather than on budget or personnel problems I knew nothing about (but I keep feeling a vague uneasiness that just for this reason perhaps I should be spending all my time in the latter fields; however, I want to learn about the management of research and you can't learn everything).

6 May '54—Finished my report and turned it in to Jim E. Also had a copy made for the head of OIR and another for the program director of the intern program. Sure feels good to have that project thesis finished.

8 May '54—Back in my own bailiwick again! Charlie T. has moved into a larger office and at least I shall have a desk of my own. The project I am to work on appears very interesting, consisting of collecting all the information on technical reports issued by Production, to see where they go, and also to see which reports come to Production from other organizations. Guess I will start off by looking over the distribution records of the printer.

15 May '54—Things are coming along. I have found out quite a bit about distribution of Production technical reports. However, there are problems. One is that the distribution office is not too keen about my survey, feeling that it is encroaching upon their prerogatives. An intern sure gets it in the neck! You are working on a project, yet you do not officially represent the office you work out of. The printing office is definitely hostile, saying the whole idea is a waste of time.

28 May '54—I have quite a bit of material on distribution of technical reports, but don't feel too happy about it. Mainly, I would like to learn something about other operations in the agency, and in Production particularly, but I never seem to get a chance. I constantly have to ask to be allowed to attend various meetings, as otherwise nobody would think to include me (constantly an outsider, by virtue of being an intern!). I am getting restless, eager to get onto a regular job where I "belong" and have responsibility for performing a task.

5 June '54—Really had to get on the ball today. We had all been wondering about what utilization would be made of us after the program's completion; it suddenly became apparent that if I did not bestir myself, I would end up right back in my old section. I looked over the organization chart and decided that the Production Planning Staff Group looked like a good place to apply. The man there seemed interested, until I mentioned that I had worked in the Comptroller's Office during my intern program. Then he cooled down considerably. Called Dr. J. and asked him to put in a good word for me, and he reported back that the man to whom I had spoken said, "Oh, Morgan. Why we got the impression he was a Comptroller-type character; interested in figures and things!" Six weeks in the Comptroller's Office and I am classed as an accountant!

12 June '54—Changed my mind and decided to shift into a completely different technical field. I had had some training in this work, and my intern program gives me a recommendation for allowing me to enter the new work. The section head where I will be located and the division office both agreed, so I will go to work there after the completion of the program.

14 June '54—In the home stretch at last! The work assignments are over, and I got all of my material on reports distribution in just in time, as the deputy director of the agency requested just such a report. Now we are back at the Civil Service Commission, discussing our activities during the program and listening to some more lectures.

18 June '54—The last day! And are we ever glad! It has been most interesting, but fatiguing. The talks we heard during the week weren't especially interesting. As the program director said, "You fellows are getting pretty hard to please." Today I presented my project thesis to the group, along with several other men who presented theirs. Next week, we all come in at intervals to see the program director for a last conference, then off for a vacation. I feel as though I have management coming out of my ears.

15 Aug. '54—Received a questionnaire from the program director, asking for evaluations of the various men we heard as speakers during

the program, for possible utilization in future programs.

15 Jan. '55—Several of the former interns gathered for lunch in the Treasury Department building. Several did as I did and shifted to different jobs; others returned to the same positions. A variety of opinions on the value of the program to them.

1 Feb. '55—Advised the Training Office on setting up a management intern program strictly within the agency. Glad to see they are going to accept my urgent pleas for a definite plan of utilization of interns after completion of the training program, plus a comprehensive orientation program on agency structure and functions before they begin work assignments.

15 Sept. '55—Had an informal get-together with the other former interns of my agency. All of us have been promoted, but we still argue about the merits of the intern program. It is beginning to seem very far away now.

10 Nov. '55—Received a copy of the manual used in the current management intern program of the Civil Service Commission; very good, incorporating lots of the ideas we threshed out during the program we were in. Also a questionnaire on our opinions of the program as a factor in our career development. Sure took a lot of soul-searching to try to decide just how my knowledge was increased, how my viewpoints were affected, to what extent participation in the program aided my progress in my career.

Conclusion

REFLECTING on the intern program as a whole, I feel that I could have learned a great deal more than I did from my work assignments. One problem I never satisfactorily surmounted was that of completing a work project while at the same time becoming acquainted with other facets of the operations about me. As I have indicated, I tried to strike a balance between working on a project and studying the operations of the particular office in which I was situated at the moment. However, while in Production I spent so much time working on my projects that there were many areas I did not become familiar with.

However, my chief complaint was lack of supervision by a responsible official in the particular office in which I was working. It is my firm belief that an official who agrees to accept an intern in his office should also accept the responsibility of seeing that the intern has the opportunity to learn something; whether he does or not, of course, is up to the intern. Too often I found myself "wandering," unsure of what I should be doing next, unaware of materials and personnel that could impart new information to me. Although everyone with whom I came into contact was most helpful and friendly, ready to answer any questions I might have, it was rare that a supervisor took the pains to sit down and determine what the best program for me would be, with occasional follow-up to determine if I was getting anywhere.

I quickly discovered that this was no program for an introvert; an intern in the circumstances had to use a lot of initiative if he was to find out anything. In all of my work assignments, I was constantly asking to be allowed to sit in on meetings which I thought would be useful to increase my knowledge of the particular area. I had to ask to be allowed to read certain files. Time and again I had to corner a busy executive to ask him to explain how this or that operation was carried on. If I heard of a briefing to be given, an exhibit to be held, or a document I wanted to read, I frantically scurried about to make sure that I was included as a participant or that the document was routed to me.

I now realize that I was constantly beset by fears and anxieties because of environmental circumstances. The main reason seemed to be that I was constantly in strange surroundings. Whereas before I entered the program I was an integral part of my research group, as an intern I was always an outsider on unfamiliar ground. Although I must emphasize that nobody ever indicated any animosity toward me, I had a perpetual "lost" feeling. Even in my own agency I had the feeling of being a stranger, for I was working in a different office with new people, working with unfamiliar material, hearing strange terms used. Whereas as a researcher in my own unit I had the comfortable feeling of being one of the group, familiar with all my source materials, as an intern I had constantly to be asserting myself,

intruding on others' privacy and thoughts, asking questions of busy people, trying to keep busy at times when I had nothing to do. Then after six weeks, when I would be getting used to my new surroundings and had struck up some friendships, off I would go to a different agency to start the process all over again.

The intern is separated from the familiar objects of his daily work existence, even to such minute items as his coffee cup. He has to hang his coat on a different rack, try to arrange to have his phone calls transferred to a new number, and always try to explain to curious people who he is and what he is doing there. The lunch hour became for me a symbol of all this "displaced person" attitude. Rarely did a supervisor ask me or any of the interns in my agency to have lunch with him so as to discuss problems of management or anything else with us. The supervisors were not being antagonistic or deliberately unkind; they simply had their own comfortable habitual arrangements for lunch and did not think to include us.

I was quite forcibly struck by an attitude which I found to be widespread in the areas where I worked or visited. I discovered that the word "administration" has very definite connotations of such types of work as budgeting, personnel, accounting, O & M, and supply. The term "management," on the other hand, seems to be much more respectable, for everybody seems to understand that even the lowest unit head is a manager. As has been noted in connection with my efforts to shift to a new position upon completion of the program, in a research organization such an association with "administration" is the kiss of death, for supervisors assume that you have no substantive abilities which they can utilize.

What can the effect of the Third Career Development Program be estimated to be upon my course since completion of the program? In one sense, I am not utilizing any of the material I learned in the program. I am not engaged in "general administration," having shifted from one specialty to another. Still an individual research analyst, I am not yet a supervisor and so do not have the problems of management in my lap.

I find that my relationship to the program is like that of a stove with the heat turned off and the radiation diminishing. I no longer hear the jargon of management, such as "communication across" and "span of control." Engaged in reading the literature of my new specialty, I no longer read the material issued on management subjects. The budget office and the various activities of the Comptroller's Office are again as remote from me as they were formerly. My contact with our Training Office has been restricted almost entirely to problems of training in my specialty. I still maintain sporadic correspondence with the interns who were in my class at American University, and many interesting problems of management and government are brought out in these letters. Occasionally I find lists of "Principles of Good Management" tacked to the bulletin board at work and I smile as some half-forgotten words come back from the past.

Yet, I feel that the program was immensely valuable to me in a broader framework than the utilization of skills learned. It lifted me out of my narrow rut and brought me into contact with a multitude of new ideas and much new knowledge. I learned a great deal about my own agency and about other agencies, both in their technical and in their "administrative" aspects. The sojourn in the Department of State was exceedingly stimulating and rewarding. Again and again I have put to use the knowledge which I gained at State about consumer relationships; I have found them to be a problem of research everywhere.

I met many people in all my positions whom I otherwise would not have met, and gained information and insights from talking with them. Intangible though it may seem, the program gave me a "feel" of governmental work and problems that I did not have before. It made me more aware of my own capabilities and, having lifted me out of my old position, made me want to strike out in new and more challenging directions. Although my contact with "management" has been waning, my interest in public administration as a whole has continued to be high since completion of the program. Tangibly, participation in the program undoubtedly was a large factor in enabling me to transfer from my former position to my new specialty rather rapidly. Last, I believe that the principles I learned about management in the program are only dormant, not dead, and that I can quickly reactivate them when I move into positions of supervision and management.

Reviews of Books and Documents

Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations

By John M. Gaus, Harvard University

THE NATION AND THE STATES, RIVALS OR PARTNERS? by William Anderson. The University of Minnesota Press, 1955. Pp. 263. $3.75.

FEDERALISM MATURE AND EMERGENT, edited by Arthur W. Macmahon. Doubleday and Company, 1955. Pp. 557. $7.50.

THE COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, A REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR TRANSMITTAL TO THE CONGRESS. June, 1955. Pp. 311. $1.25.

THE STATES AND THE NATION, by Leonard D. White. Louisiana State University Press, 1953. Pp. 103. $2.75.

WHEN William Anderson published his *Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations; A Budget of Suggestions for Research* (from which the title of this review is gratefully borrowed) in 1946, the volume was reviewed in *The American Political Science Review* by Charles McKinley. (Vol. 41, pp. 561-63) He closed his review with a reference to the 1940 Report of the Canadian Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, and its research monographs, and the query, "Is there not a good case for a similar Domesday survey of the comparable aspects of federalism in the United States?" Leonard White, in his Edward Douglass White lectures at the Louisiana State University seven years later, published in the volume listed above, concludes with suggestions, one of which (at p. 97) calls for a "large-scale, top-level study of federal-state relations." Even as his lectures were issuing from the press, the new political leadership in Washington was authorizing the establishment of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which William Anderson was to be a member and for which he prepared *The Nation and the States.* Among the symposia arranged by Columbia University as a part of the exercises in celebration of its 1954 Bicentennial was that on federalism, organized by Arthur Macmahon, who in another of the volumes listed above has edited, introduced, and provided a setting of interpretation for the papers presented and discussed there.

Perhaps Professor McKinley is a bit overwhelmed at the deluge which has followed a little after his suggestion. Perhaps he remembers the preacher who in a drought prayed to the Lord for rain. At once the rains came—a deluge, a destructive flood; and on the following Sunday, he was prompted to rebuke Him gently at such excess, pointing out that while rain had been asked for, "You shouldn't be ridiculous!" Certainly your reviewer feels overwhelmed—and at that the present list is only a part of the flood of writings on the topic that have recently appeared and that continue to appear. One thinks, for example, of the *Studies in Federalism,* edited by Robert R. Bowie and Carl J. Friedrich (Little, Brown and Co., 1954), or the just-issued report of the Eighth American Assembly at Arden House on *The Forty Eight States* (Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, 1955). And in the Autumn, 1955, issue of this *Review* Professor Hallie Farmer surveys some books on state governments in terms relevant to the present subject.

Yet however overwhelming the extent of the materials, a reviewer must attempt not only briefly to indicate the nature of the books assigned to him but to discuss their setting and their interconnections. The fact that the two authors and the editor-planner have had a major part in the development of the study of public administration invites some special—almost proprietary—attention in the *Public Administration Review.* What have "Our Boys"

got to say on these matters which fifty years ago were left chiefly to the lawyers and historians?

I

NOTE first that Anderson's title of 1946, "Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations," is prophetic. The Commission was on "Intergovernmental Relations." Macmahon reserves one of his four parts for "Functional Channels of Relationship." White proposes not only the special commission noted above, but a "joint standing committee on federal-state relations." We have now, it seems, a wide agreement that a most fruitful line of inquiry into a federal system of government will not be confined to a striking of balance as to functions, powers, and conflicts of rival entities, but a continuing series of functional working "relations."

This is so obvious and accepted among us that to state it here may seem wasteful. But consider the domestic American setting in which these studies appeared. The Democratic party, which had been in power in the twenty years of depression, New Deal, war, and postwar activities was replaced by the Republican party. Those who had resented the programs of the New Deal, and all eager to cut down war and postwar activities and expenditures, could find some line of attack in denouncing the expansion as if it were at the expense of the states. (Note Anderson's discussion of such philosophies at pp. 236-8.) The special note of antiexecutive sentiment, reflected in the Twenty-second Amendment, is probably related also to general antigovernment views, perhaps also to war weariness; and a recourse to "states' rights" seems related to them all. Again, as the international situation has deteriorated and the dangers of atomic war have loomed, many have come to feel that so great are the tasks of foreign policy and defense inevitably falling upon the national government that positive efforts should be made to place as much of the domestic functions of government upon the states as possible. This view is strongly presented by White (p. 5).

But interest in the nature of a federal system of government has in the last ten years also been positive and creative because of the more widely shared heritage of the war. The search for some reconciliation of national states with larger inclusive systems whereby peace might be achieved and economic problems dealt with more effectively, and the development of resources expedited, has resulted in new federal systems or the refurbishing of old, both world wide and in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Some of the ablest public men and scholars of our time are at work on these matters.

One recalls what Wordsworth said of the institution-builders of his youth as laboring

> Not in Utopia—subterranean fields,—
> Of some secreted island, Heaven knows where!
> But in the very world, which is the world
> Of all of us, ...

Part Four of the Columbia symposium contains the treatment of this important contemporary experience in federal government—the "emergent" phase, in Macmahon's characteristically felicitous phrase, on the international level.

Most striking of all, to this reviewer, is the direction of inquiry and recommendation in these books as to the American system. One cannot be certain how wide and deep the sharing of their thought may be—how far it is confined to political scientists, for example. Certainly it runs against the atmosphere of domestic opinion noted above. For their direction is toward a critical examination of the capacity of state governments to deal effectively with their present functions, or any kind which may be transferred to them from the national government. Behind such currents of thought are the researches and writings of two generations of scholars and investigators of government process and structure and of particular substantive fields. A characteristic example of this interpretation of institutional inadequacy from a careful analysis of substantive experience was the article by Vincent Ostrom entitled "State Administration of Natural Resources in the West" (47 *The American Political Science Review* 478-93, June, 1953). His conclusion is relevant to the tendency noted above:

> If the western states are to assume a greater role in the conservation and development of natural resources, they must first put their own houses in

order. Resource programs need to be developed in terms of a comprehensive review and re-definition of agencies, values, assumptions and policies. There are a few signs on the horizon which indicate that possibly some states, California for example, may lead the way in an effort to redefine the role of the western states in natural resources administration. Otherwise, so far as resource development is concerned, the states are apt to become anachronisms like counties, to be tolerated as they muddle through.

Another contribution from the political scientists, particularly those most closely in touch with the conduct of state and local government, is a clearer grasp of the factors that have led to a wider use of national government, and of the extent to which policies of the national government have bolstered financially and extended the activities of both state and local governments. The recourse to verbal dogmas and phrases so long—and still—employed in discussion of our federal system, the search for sovereignty so beloved of orators, they largely reject for a more intensive and comprehensive recording of the influence of technology, prices and markets, and other economic matters, of war and defense, the shifts of population, and the more intensive drains upon natural resources.

II

There is not unanimity, however, with all this reflection of the cumulative studies of the operation of our system noted above. Some observations by White, for example, in the earliest published of the books under review, are challenged warmly by the later book, addressed to a different occasion, by Anderson. (Note Anderson's chapter on "The Self-Government of the States," which may be read as a reply to White.) White has used his three lectures as a means of expressing his views, as he approached the close of his long and crowded years of teaching, on this large and complex topic.

> . . . I do not assert that the states are in immediate danger, nor that much that has happened in transferring power and influence upward has been harmful. I do predict, however, that if present trends continue for another quarter century, the states may be left hollow shells, operating primarily as the field districts of federal departments and dependent upon the federal treasury for their support. This result would be bad for the federal government and would hold grave consequences for the kind of self-governing, local democracy that has been an essential part of our way of life.
>
> I shall consequently argue in these essays that the march of power to Washington should be reversed wherever it is possible, that the states should strengthen their capacity to take a greater share in the burden of government, and that they should preserve a wide range of freedom of action in programs jointly supported and administered. (p. 3)

This is his "own value choice at this period of American history." He follows at once, however, with a brief account of the evolution of our system, and a candid recording of the strength of the forces that have led to greater functions on the national level, but also notes expansion in state activities. He follows with a lecture on the continuing strength and importance of the states, improvements in their government, and the role of the Council of State Governments, "itself a constellation," and other associations at "1313"—"the national capital of state and local government in the United States"—whose life he has been able to observe from the first establishment of that center neighboring his university.

But he warns that the strength of the states must be used, and their improvement must continue; and ends with some suggestions for the use of their strength, and for the studies and committees referred to above. A special note is his tribute to emotional ties and loyalties centering in the states. He is more hopeful, too, than was Professor Hallie Farmer in her review, of a new turn in the cycle whereby states may again, as earlier in the century, experiment and pioneer. And he ends by a rejection of fatalistic acceptance of trends and an appeal that Americans "cease to complain about the march of power to Washington, and instead devote their talents for political invention to divert the flow of power to those areas where it can be wisely used and effectively controlled." (pp. 100-101)

This urbane, even-tempered, and reasonable presentation, characteristic of its author and appropriate to the lectureship, presents a look backward over one phase of White's life work, albeit not a central one, and offers a direction and tone of policy for a quarter century ahead.

III

ANDERSON's book has a different timing. It is a distilling under the conditions of heat necessary to that process, of the experience and thought of another teacher and scholar whose work from the beginning has been close to government locally and in the states, and who sees the role of the national government, given the forces depicted by White—and in more detail on a larger canvas by himself—as not only natural and rooted but complementary and for the most part desirable. His book carries the force of an argument addressed to a critical moment, with the tang of first-hand and detailed acquaintance from his studies of government—all government—in Minnesota. Probably the best review of his book and of the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was his own impressive and moving "A Political Scientist's Report to the Political Science Profession" at the Boulder meeting of the American Political Science Association last September. For the book includes a brief appraisal of the "climate of opinion" in which the commission met; an account of "the federal system in operation" which widens vistas from the focus on national-state relations to include the local governments, increasingly built into the federal system; a major Part II, prepared for the early use of the commission, on constitutional history, problems, and issues; a discussion, Part III, of "issues of policy and finance" illustrative of some typical institutional-functional developments, taxation, grants-in-aid; and analyses of the status, powers, and operation of the state governments and local governments. Running through these chapters is the theme of the interrelation of all three, the relating of function to the area of a problem, to constitutional and resources power, and to practical capacities and equipment.

At the beginning—"About This Book"—and at the end—"A Program of Constructive Action"—Anderson sets forth with eloquence clearly derived from deep feeling and from an effort to focus his long experience and study in these matters, his considered credo, to counterattack the views of those he believes mistaken in theory or ignorant of how our system really operates, or both, to remind us that our system has changed with conditions and should be expected to continue to change, and to list innumerable accomplishments we have achieved and innumerable lines of improvement needed in all levels and fields. "Work with and from what has already been devised to what is practically attainable. Do not reason out a theory unrelated to the facts and then prescribe it and force it upon those who must administer the program." (p. 252)

His credo at page xi in his introductory "About This Book," itself reflects his own militant assertion against elements in the "climate of opinion" he depicts in his first chapter:

> I believe that the system of government of the United States under the Constitution is probably the greatest achievement of the entire human race up to now in the construction of a political system that will provide strong and active government for every national and local need and emergency, and at the same time ensure a maximum of attainable personal liberty and popular control over what the government does. . . .
>
> I believe that the American people today, operating through their system of government, provide the most important, yes the one indispensable tower of strength among the free nations of the world as they face the forces of militant world communism.

Anderson's book was issued before the work of the commission was completed. His Boulder speech presents a retrospective view of its then completed history. We may urge upon him a new edition of his book, in which the speech would be published, along with a personal memoir of his experiences in the study, teaching, and consulting participancy in these matters. The very fact that his statement reflects an occasion, a moment of some tension and uncertainty of outcome, and displays deep feeling of one participating actively at the center of controversy, enhances its value to our profession.

In his presidential address at Boulder (46 *The American Political Science Review* 961-79), Charles McKinley remarked that he was "at best, agnostic about Professor Anderson's eloquent statement of conviction" quoted above. Yet he pointed out that "in the development of a science of politics" we are obligated to go beyond observation, description, and generalization "to search for clues from our own his-

tory and from comparative experience that may be helpful in the institutional adaptations most likely to resolve the problems of governance that lie ahead." Whatever differences in view as to our federal system may exist among White, Anderson, Macmahon, and McKinley, whose *Uncle Sam in the Pacific Northwest* (University of California Press, 1952) might well be grouped with the books under review, all unite in representing at its best among our political scientists that "search for clues . . . helpful in institutional adaptation."

IV

THE *Report to the President* of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations records (Appendix B, p. 285) the names of the many political scientists on its staff who contributed to its work. It will long be, like the *Report* of the President's Committee on Administrative Management in 1937, a part of our teaching materials. In spite of the controversial nature of the issues with which it deals and the nature of the controversies in the period of its preparation, and contrary to much expectation, it shifts the focus from immediate discontent and extreme dogmas to opportunities for long creative work on concrete questions. It frankly records that the outlook of its members "in concentrating on the intergovernmental aspects of a number of hotly debated policy issues . . . has frequently undergone substantial modification." (p. ix) As a result, it holds that:

> . . . The National Government and the States should be regarded not as competitors for authority but as two levels of government cooperating with or complementing each other in meeting the growing demands on both. Chiefly because of war and the recurring threat of war, the expenditures of the National Government have grown much larger than those of the States and localities. But State and local activities also continue to expand. Equally significant is the increased interest in and recognition of the importance of State and local governments as essential elements in an effective federal structure. (p. 2)

From this philosophy, the step to recommending attention to the improvement of all levels of government was natural. The genius and labors of Chairman Kestnbaum, the willingness of the members to hang together yet with outlet for recording at points personal and group reservation to particular passages, and what must have been outstanding staff work in preparation and drafting, combine to make this document valuable and significant. It is both, whether taken as a study in politics, as a shifting in emphasis and approach to our federal system, or as a recording of points of friction requiring continuing attention. Only one member registered general dissent, Senator Morse, because he felt that the report does not give "due emphasis to the rights and jurisdiction of federal sovereignty. . . . Nevertheless I recommend with enthusiasm the reading of the report by the American people." (p. 279)

The report is in two parts. The first is on more general topics—"The Evolution of the American Federal System," "The Role of the States," "National Responsibilities and Cooperative Relations," "Financial Aspects," and "Federal Grants-in-Aid." Part II consists of twelve chapters on "Intergovernmental Functional Responsibilities" from agriculture to welfare. Recommendations are not hurled *en masse* at the reader, but are interspersed at relevant points in the discussion. Comment of members in reservation or qualification as to the text are similarly scattered throughout. The effect is that one seems participating in discussion rather than witnessing the recording of dogmas or the striking of poses.

The general direction of the whole is that recorded here earlier—a shift from emphasis on conflict over constitutional doctrine (although this is at points present) to emphasis on the improvement of the operation of a system embracing three levels with variety and peculiarity in organization, process, and finance for each substantive field of relations. There is a shift from concern over "states' rights" to one for state responsibilities, capacity, and equipment. Thus state constitutional restrictions, legislative districting, and the recognition of new aspects of the problem of government in metropolitan regions give evidence of the use of data and observation hitherto neglected in much formal political debate on our federal system. Sixteen staff and study committee reports issued by the commission are listed (p. 295) covering a number of sub-

stantive fields and comparing grant-in-aid programs and their impact on state administration and finance.

The startling thing about the recommendations is that they are not startling, unless one recalls the atmosphere within which the commission was brought to birth. The call for continuing attention to intergovernmental relations in the Executive Office of the President (p. 87) has already been met by the appointment of Chairman Kestnbaum as special assistant to the President on the follow-up of the recommendations of the commission. (Note, for example, pp. 88-89, for more general suggestions.)

Recommendations for change within substantive fields reflect again less a tendency toward major shifts or transfers than a press for improvement in procedure and operation—warnings against the by-passing of "regularly constituted executive and budgetary channels at the state level," clarification of status of grant-aided state officials. White's suggestion that soil conservation functions be transferred to the states (all of them? the term is more ambiguous each year!) finds reflection in proposals at pp. 156-163. (Two senators, three representatives, even two Governors from the South, including Governor Shivers of Texas, dissent!) But pick your field, turn to the relevant chapter. A characteristic statement (p. 243):

> *The Commission recommends that the Congress and the executive branch of the National Government adopt the policy that capital costs of multipurpose, basinwide water resource developments be equitably divided between the National Government and the States concerned, in the light of benefits received, ability to pay, and other attendant circumstances.*
>
> The right of the States and localities to share in the planning and execution of basinwide water development carries with it the corresponding responsibility of the inhabitants to pay a reasonable portion of the project costs.

Vocational education grants-in-aid may have done their job; but new categories may be needed. (The Constitution, like the tariff, may almost be said to be a local, or at least a functional, issue.) The statement (at pp. 145-49) of the problem of dealing with the wide array of substantive issues—which the commission did not dodge in taking what it calls "a more pragmatic approach"—is candid. The people's business must be carried on; no one group, or generation, can have wisdom and knowledge enough to strike off, at a given moment, what changes are desirable. But there is a big budget of useful work set forth here.

V

The heat of conflict present in some stages in the birth and life of the commission was not perceptible in the sessions at Arden House, during a week of January snows. The atmosphere was genial; and unity, or at least the greatest relationship possible among contributions to a symposium, was assured by the perfection-seeking industry and skill of Arthur Macmahon, planner and editor of *Federalism Mature and Emergent*. The essays are twenty-two in number, grouped in four parts, and interrelated and given setting by Macmahon's contribution of a general introduction entitled "The Problems of Federalism: A Survey" and introductory chapters to the three other parts. The first part is the most general —"Federalism: Its Nature and Role"; the discussants are Macmahon, Wheare, Neumann, Fischer, and Berle. Part II, "Basic Controls in a Maturing System" (Wechsler, Truman, Holcombe, Freund, Hart, Hays, and Dowling), considers "The Political Process," "The Courts and the Law," and "Legislative and Executive Responsibilities in Managing a Federal System." In Part III, "Functional Channels of Relationship" (Gaus, McKinley, Handler, Weidner, and Blough), there are "illustrative studies of functional fields" (natural resources) and of "overall aspects"—decision-making and fiscal. Part IV includes the papers on "Supranational Union in Western Europe" (Diebold, Svennilson, Clark, Bowie, and Friedrich). There is first presented "The Economic Background and Functional Developments," and finally, "The Project of a Political Community."

Thus, while the other books under review here center upon American experience and within that on the administrative aspects of intergovernmental relations, the Columbia symposium has a wider range while retaining a reflection of the present moment when the

federal principle is revealing new life and application. Such an effort at appraisal was natural and appropriate for Hamilton's Alma Mater, and the tone and character common to most of the essays is equally appropriate to one of the authors of *The Federalist Papers.* The recording of concrete experience is balanced by the search for meaningful definition and principle. There is reflection of current events and of present urgencies, but they are interpreted in the light of arrangements that seem peculiar and central to a unique form, process, and purpose as unfolded over the years.

The opportunity thus provided to take a wider view of federal government in varied settings of time, place, and purpose, with the running comment of an editor equipped to hold his contributors to a consideration of central issues and problems and determined to search out general principles from the varied contributions, has special value to us, engrossed in our present American problems. It was suggested above that the emphasis hinted in employment of the term "intergovernmental relations," an emphasis on the operating of the federal system through policy and administration, is a shift away from an earlier emphasis on constitutional interpretation. But students of administration are students of political science as well. The daily news of conflict over segregation may remind us that there is more at stake than grants-in-aid or the responsibility for public employment exchanges, important as the contribution from each of these may be to the creation of conditions of life that ease the tensions and conflicts arising from other matters.

The Columbia symposium therefore has a double value. It records for the future student of federalism appraisals of its present manifestations after—should we say in the midst of? —a period of wars and rapid technical, economic, and social change. And it reminds the present student to stretch his outlook and deepen his search for more things than he is likely to dream of in his special field.

VI

YET as one student turns from the symposium back to the other volumes reviewed here, he wonders whether all the questions McKinley may have had in mind in his review ten years ago have yet got stated afresh. The possible attachment of Americans to their states as entities of a more human scale is noted only by White, among the authors here. A prophecy by Frederick Jackson Turner in a paper fifty years ago (printed in *The Significance of Sections in American History,* Holt, 1932), leads one to a somewhat related consideration.

> . . . I make the suggestion that, as the nation reaches a more stable equilibrium, a more settled state of society, with denser populations pressing upon the means of existence, with this population no longer migratory, the influence of the diverse physiographic provinces which make up a nation will become more marked. They will exercise sectionalizing influences, tending to mould society to their separate conditions, in spite of all the countervailing tendencies toward national uniformity. National action will be forced to recognize and adjust itself to these regional interests. . . . Congressional legislation will be shaped by compromises and combinations, which will in effect be treaties between rival sections, and the real federal aspect of our government will lie, not in the relation of state and nation, but in the relation of section and section. (pp. 313-14)

Well, we are probably less "settled," and perhaps more "migratory" than when Turner wrote. But there is a relevance of these remarks to the domestic news of the day about schools, roads, rivers, defense plant location and contracts, to our unfinished business of improved methods of relating limited resources to unlimited demands. The "treaties" are made through a Congress one House of which represents, as appropriate to a federal system, the corporate constituent units, of greatly varying population, resources, and needs. The better preparation of policy at each important strategic point of decision-making—electorate, party, legislature, and executive—engrosses our attention and effort. All of these studies add to our knowledge of how urgent is our need for such improvement because of the peculiarities of a federal system. Presumably it is guardian of unique qualities of place, people, and idea. Should we also enquire as to how far the conditions—technical and many others—that influence our life do make, as Turner suggested they would, for richness and

variety? Perhaps we should note another passage of Turner's:

> ... Men are not absolutely dictated to by climate, geography, soils, or economic interests. The influence of the stock from which they sprang, the inherited ideals, the spiritual factors, often triumph over the material interests. . . . Not seldom the ideals grow out of the interests. It is the statesman's duty and his great opportunity to lift his section to a higher and broader, a more far-seeing, conception of its interests as a part of the Union, to induce his section to accept the compromises and adjustments which he arranges with the leaders of other sections in the spirit of reconciliation of interests in the nation as a whole. (*Ibid.*, pp. 337-38)

The political scientist is one among many who are needed in these continuing tasks of analysis of our changing society, even in studies of so apparently technical a subject as our federal system. Analyses of population, of the economy of areas (stimulated now as well by development aspirations of so many regions of the world), of custom, architecture, literature, and the arts have relevance to the student of the politics and administration of a federal system and intergovernmental relations. All over the world they say that American life is uniform and standardized. And when you drive along many of our main roads, for hundreds of miles you may experience this in the life and appearance of the highway. But turn off, and follow even for a short distance a secondary or local road, and you begin to discover difference, variety, the tang of character. How to use both, and improve both, is a joint enterprise. In these books the political scientists have contributed knowledge, experience, good temper, and a sense of strategy. But we are an unfinished country, and have yet to know our landscape.

TVA Management in the Perspective of Two Decades

By Charles McKinley, Reed College

The TVA; An Approach to the Development of a Region, by Gordon R. Clapp. University of Chicago Press, 1955. Pp. 206. $3.50.

Personnel Policy in a Public Agency; The TVA Experience, by Harry L. Case. Harper & Brothers, 1955. Pp. 176. $3.00.

Experiment in Management; Personnel Decentralization in the Tennessee Valley Authority, by Robert S. Avery. University of Tennessee Press, 1954. Pp. 212. $4.50.

One River—Seven States; TVA-State Relations in the Development of the Tennessee River, by Elliott Roberts. Bureau of Public Administration, University of Tennessee, June, 1955. Pp. 100. $1.50.

Region Building; Community Development Lessons from the Tennessee Valley, by James Dahir. Harper & Brothers, 1955. Pp. 208. $3.75.

I

Books about the first and only "experimental" national-regional valley authority continue to find a market despite the failure of Congress either to seek a careful, comprehensive appraisal of its work or to permit this experiment to be copied outside of the Tennessee Valley.

Because James Dahir's volume is but partly related to the central administrative questions about the Tennessee Valley Authority, a brief comment to indicate its nature before laying it aside seems warranted. It is written for an audience primarily interested in "regionalism" (though the author's notions of this term elude my grasp) and its relation to the improvement of community life and urban planning. His chief contributions to matters relating to the TVA are found in his assembly of many interesting facts about the adjustment of the towns of Decatur, Guntersville, and the tri-cities (Florence, Sheffield, and Tuscumbia) to the TVA main-stream reservoir structures and to the navigation developments which followed in their train. One may also find bits of information (most of it not new) about many other things occurring in the valley and adjacent territory, and even in the far corners of the world. But the reader must possess pa-

tience to endure the sweet rhetoric with which the author clothes his admirable sentiments.

The other four books provide valuable insights into some of the TVA's important administrative experiences. They markedly enrich our information and in many respects afford additional materials with which to make partial appraisals of this valley authority agency as a resource development mechanism. These contributions are the work of men each of whom has been employed by TVA for a period ranging from six to twenty-one years. Case is still the director of its Personnel Division. Avery and Roberts ended their official connections some years ago. Thus, while their studies have had the benefit of a "participating observer" relationship and of access to agency files and records, their freedom to express critical judgments concerning agency activity has been clearly enlarged.

Gordon Clapp, whom President Eisenhower superseded as TVA chairman some months before the lectures which constitute the body of his book were published, has also left Knoxville. His impending disassociation gives these valedictory lectures additional value because in them he speaks more frankly concerning some of the large controversial issues in which the TVA was enmeshed than would have been possible had he remained its chairman. His book reviews significant experiences in building the river structures, the impact of TVA's programs upon the lives, work (industrial and agricultural), and spirit of the valley people, the policies and techniques used by TVA in its collaboration with the states and local agencies, its contributions to the improved production and use of chemical fertilizers, and its assistance to the munitions needs of the nation.

Two chapters examine the national electric power policy question. Clapp uses TVA experience for the incidental light it throws upon the issues. He declares for a national power policy to provide at the lowest possible cost a supply of electric energy not only to meet all current needs but to assure a good margin of energy in advance of the constantly growing demand. Without this margin, and without the lowest economic prices for power, the rate of industrial growth, which he believes must be constantly encouraged to support a dynamic free enterprise economy and the nation's defense needs, cannot be assured. Essential to low-cost expanding service is the establishment of publicly owned systems to compete with private electric utilities, not within the same service areas but geographically adjacent so that the mutual stimulus of public and private enterprise electric service will key up the public service efforts of both systems.

His case, however, points toward the expansion of public ownership in the power industry. He uses public and cooperative distribution agencies in their respective territories to show how public agency policy and service performance have injected greater courage into rate and investment policies of the private utilities. He recites at length the unvarying underestimates in prediction of electric power demands made by the private utility industry before and since the war, not only in the TVA region but nationally. Theirs is a history of resistance to power plant expansion, to servicing rural territory, to the encouragement of new appliance uses, in contrast with the public enterprise of the Bonneville Power Administration, the TVA, and the electric co-ops sponsored by the latter.

But Clapp also proposes to encourage private utilities to take the risks of investing in new power supplies, either by some mode of government guarantee from loss, in case excess supply actually occurs, or by government loans. The latter could take the form of nonvoting preferred stock, with dividends limited to rates low enough to cover the cost of money to the government plus a reserve against losses. These policies would replace the present accelerated tax amortization method of encouraging new utility capacity, ostensibly for defense purposes but actually of chief value for nonmilitary demand. While Clapp would reserve hydroelectric development on the great river systems for federal agencies, as necessary for comprehensive, integrated river basin development, he urges assistance to private utilities so that they will expand their steam-electric facilities, upon which most of the nation will depend for electric energy, with new, large, low-cost units. Only in this way, he believes, will many ob-

solete, high-cost generating stations be scrapped and low-cost energy secured.

In Clapp's review of TVA's management evolution, while it rebuilt the river, certain episodes stand out for their illumination of important issues. One of these relates to the public-private power question. This was the so-called "race" between TVA and a new Ebasco-serviced private utility, Electric Energy, Incorporated, in the building of two huge steam plants of identical capacity to serve the Atomic Energy Commission's gaseous diffusion installation at Paducah, Kentucky. This division of power supply, Clapp relates, stemmed from the reversal of an earlier request by the commission, soon after the start of the Korean War, for the TVA to supply its entire new requirement of 1,000,000 kilowatts. It was quickly hailed by many TVA critics as a demonstration of the job performance superiority, in cost and time, of private enterprise. Actually, because of the war and the necessary restrictions on defense materials it had been agreed that the private utility's Joppa Plant should have defense priorities for essential metals and shop space so as to put its first unit on the line three months ahead of production at the TVA Shawnee Plant. Yet TVA was able to complete the construction of its first two units more than two months before Electric Energy, Inc. was ready, and all four units were in operation at Shawnee while two of the four Joppa plant units were still unfinished. Moreover, the final cost of power per kilowatt of capacity put the TVA well under its estimate of $147.50, while for Joppa the latest estimate for the four units was $184—with two additional units running up to $198. Summarizing the meaning of this episode, Clapp says:

> . . . Why, then, was TVA able to move out in front and keep its costs within its estimates as compared with the job across the river? Its history provides the answer: the twenty-year record of an organization skilled in the management of men and materials and pledged to a practice of performance and accountability time after time. (pp. 49-50)

The moral to this story, as Clapp sees it (and as the reviewer would agree) is: "Enterprise is where you find it." This is a salutary reminder of an important administrative truth for a nation which, in spite of current shouting to the contrary, will continue to depend upon a *mixed* system of public and private enterprise.

A second striking example of an experimental and comparative role played by TVA for public and private enterprise, which Clapp recites, is the story of the building of Douglas Dam. The record time of twelve months and sixteen days between the beginning of construction and the closing of the reservoir gates to ready this great structure for delivery of the power required by the war defense program is ascribed to "the years of preparation, practice, training, and achievement that preceded it." But the organization and training rested upon the decision in 1933 to build dams with its own personnel, or in the jargon, by "force account." Says Clapp: "Had the board been in the practice of letting dams to contract, it would not even have been possible for it to have recommended the project to the President or to have met the critically shortened schedule."

This assertion raises administrative and congressional issues of policy for all our major river development projects. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, partly from statutory requirement and from administrative practice, pursue the opposite policy of doing major jobs, except projects which private groups find unprofitable, by contract. If, as Clapp implies, costs in time and money—and time *is* money in the returns on these great fixed capital structures—can be sharply reduced by direct construction and employment by the public agencies in charge of river control, the economic feasibility of the nonreimbursable purposes of flood control, navigation, recreation, etc., and the financial feasibility of irrigation will be increased and the ultimate costs of power will be reduced. These are elemental goals in water resource management. Their attainment warrants an objective, full-dress inquiry, free from ideological fixations about private versus public enterprise.

II

EXPLICIT and implicit in much that Clapp has to tell about the TVA success story is its personnel program. Two of the volumes here reviewed are devoted to this subject. That

by Director Case is essentially a lucid, brief exposition of the principal policies and practices which have been followed by the TVA in the exercise of its freedom from the standard federal civil service legal requirements and in pursuit of the injunction of Congress to create its own merit system. Much of this experience has been told before, but nowhere so fully as in these two studies. As Case insists, the administrative climate within which the personnel policies have been developed and applied has afforded an especially favorable environment within which to try out a more flexible, imaginative, and tailor-made personnel management program. And success, which might have been failure in another context, has helped to stabilize that climate.

Yet it cannot be doubted that the standard processes of recruitment, selection, evaluation, and of delegation of authority within the regular national civil service system and by other public organizations have copied from the TVA experience, even though the rate of "cultural diffusion" has been slow. It may be that the dam construction policy of TVA, which necessitated an employee group preponderantly of skilled and unskilled manual workers, compelled some of its personnel innovations. Certainly it led to the innovations in collective bargaining between a government agency and labor unions, with many ancillary employer-employee practices. For here it was faced by problems the private contractor would have confronted. Of these relations and practices both books give excellent accounts, with Avery providing a more detailed exposition and an elevated eyebrow about some of them.

It becomes clear from Avery's account that the concessions to the trades unions have brought this government agency within paper partition thickness of a union shop policy. This he suggests requires skillful rationalization to reconcile with the "merit and efficiency" injunctions in the basic statute. When trades union membership becomes a preference factor in deciding who receives employment, who gets promoted, and who is retained when reduction in force impends, it requires a conception of merit and efficiency transcending the customary individual qualities to furnish this reconciliation. This becomes all the more evident when it is noted that for the trades and labor force no formal, periodic service (efficiency) review is made. While such appraisal is made for other classes of employees, the trades unions have successfully fought its application to their personnel. Avery points out that since union membership among the skilled workers is almost 100 per cent, this means that in cases of reduction in force, seniority, not merit, becomes the essential test of retention.

But perhaps it is arguable that the larger concern for efficiency has been kept in view if TVA's relative freedom from work stoppages, its ability to hold competent personnel in the face of great labor demand in private industry, the fruitfulness of non-paid employee suggestions for work improvement and reduction in costs, etc., are taken into consideration.

Avery's study scrutinizes in particular the application of the decentralization theory of personnel management which is the avowed official TVA conception. This is a conception which is professed for all parts of the organization. Let Director Case state it:

> Probably the first essential in supervisory development is the administrative practice of liberal delegation of responsibility. In the learning process nothing takes the place of real responsibility. . . . And too many organizations are deficient in the number of points or levels at which genuine responsibility, especially of an administrative character, is assigned.
>
> Since TVA has consistently carried out a policy of delegating responsibility, it has to that extent provided the most essential condition for successful supervisory development. The assumption is made that men in responsible positions can be and must be trusted to make decisions within the framework of the broad purposes and policies set down by the Board. The Board recognizes that under such a system of delegations men will make mistakes—some of them fairly large ones—but it is prepared to take this chance in the interests of the more imaginative and responsible results which flow from this practice of trusting people to make decisions. (pp. 34-35)

Against this administrative-philosophic avowal, Avery's detailed exploration of structure and practice constitutes an interesting evaluation. Administrative decentralization of the Personnel Division began early. By a series of steps it had by 1944 reached substan-

tially its present structure and allocations of responsibilities. Under this system a personnel generalist is assigned to each operating department. He is presumed to function as a "miniature director of personnel for the department to which he is allotted." As the key man in the decentralization program he is at once the operating department's counselor and the agency's personnel inspector. The official view of this arrangement states:

"By the adoption of this structure, the personnel department has gradually developed an organization in which day-to-day issues are decided close to the point of origin by persons familiar with factors concerned, and new policy questions are quickly referred to a level where organization-wide perspective is available. By concentrating all dealing with the departments in the hands of personnel officers, routine problems can be disposed of readily. . . . As responsibility for personnel actions has shifted more and more to the operating departments, the work of personnel officers has increasingly been that of advice and assistance in the application of policies and standards." (p. 58)

Under this pattern the central personnel office has become chiefly a staff agency. Avery feels that this shrinking of its tasks and reliance upon the generalists assigned to the operating units for advice and guidance to the operating people has produced good results except in the training sector. The training program, generally, in his view, has lagged behind needs, including those of the generalist personnel officers. He does not question the soundness of the decentralizing system, or the importance attached to the personal generalist scheme. But he feels that the central office has not succeeded as fully as it ought in preparing operating officers "to accept and discharge their new responsibilities."

One weakness in the system is the tendency of operating administrators to hang onto personnel authority rather than to pass it along to middle management and to supervisors. Thus it is that the "theory that personnel and general management are inseparable is violated at the operating level because of the handling of personnel matters by administrative officers which should be handled by supervisors themselves." (p. 186) Yet the expression of this tendency is not uniform, and part of its variability clearly relates to the special requirements or circumstances in different operating situations. (Avery's detailed inquiry into operating practices is limited to two major divisions.) Thus, for example, employment is centralized in the chief of the Works Branch of the Division of Chemical Engineering in order to make best use of the trades and labor manpower through transfers and to avoid unnecessary reductions in force. But in the Research Branch, where this problem is practically absent, section heads take charge of selection.

The cure for this centralization tendency, where it is not justified, lies, as Avery sees it, in a more thoroughgoing training program both for administrative officers and for supervisors in the lower echelons.

In the supervision of the trades and labor staff there is the special management problem which private industry so often encounters of the dual allegiance of the first-line supervisor. He not only may be a member of the union but is included within the bargaining unit. Such a foreman is represented by union officials in collective bargaining over wages, etc. But when the foreman is obliged to enforce agency rules against recalcitrant workmen or to carry out some other unpalatable management decision he may find himself *persona non grata* with his union and subject to its sanctions. This dual allegiance problem indicates the difficulty in government as well as in private employment of reconciling organizational and union-employee interests.

Perhaps a more complete sampling of the actual expression of the theory of decentralized management in the whole of TVA could reveal other significant phenomena and add to the insights and conclusions reached here. It is to be hoped that it might also indicate the extent to which sensitivity in supervision to the "human relations" phase of management finds systematic and deliberate expression. Nothing of this character emerges in this study.

III

In his introductory lecture Clapp restates the administrative virtues of the valley authority which David Lilienthal had so eloquently elaborated more than a decade before. There is the same emphasis on TVA's superiority

over the traditional structure in the national executive because of its regional development mission and its regional situs. There is also the duty "to seek a blend of federal, state, and local concerns, with responsibility defined in fairly specific terms." He again describes and brings up to date the collaboration with the states and with local agencies in forestry, electric power distribution and service, local flood control (including experimental small watershed planning), and in research in many subject matter fields. Criticisms of the older national agency policies and their state-local relationships are occasionally implied in these accounts. Thus, in summarizing the results of TVA's forestry program we are told:

> . . . These results have been achieved without the exercise of any power of coercion. There has been no invasion of the property rights of landowners; TVA has not encroached upon the responsibility or functions of the state and local governments. (p. 78)

The great increase in numbers of technical personnel employed by the state forestry agencies and in total funds expended, and the expansion of their state forest programs since 1933, seem from this account to be primarily the work of TVA. (pp. 78-79) Where was the Forest Service during these two decades? What was happening to state and private interest in improved forestry in the forested areas of adjacent and other regions during this same period? Without carefully assembled comparative data reflective of funds spent per unit of forest land or industry, and more information about the parallel activities of agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the seven valley states and elsewhere, together with an evaluation of the impact of the skyrocketing timber values throughout the United States, the meaning of Clapp's impressive data as an assessment of TVA effort will remain obscure.

Though Clapp does not review TVA's soil conservation program, administered via test and community demonstration projects by the state extension services, a similar comparative evaluation of this important aspect of its land management effort needs to be made before we shall know how to evaluate the varying administrative methods that have been applied in the nationwide push toward this goal of the past two decades.

The utilization of the states and local governments has been erected into a kind of ideological shibboleth by other TVA spokesmen. From this tendency, despite his self-restraint and candor, Clapp does not wholly escape. Thus, after noting that the provisions of the TVA statute of 1933 were "replete with language and ideas recognizing the role of the states in the task of rebuilding the Tennessee Valley," he declares: "In the light of American history this new method of intergovernmental cooperation may be viewed as an illuminating example of creative federalism." One may ask if his history books omitted all mention of the grant-in-aid programs, and the national-state-local administrative collaboration thereby set in train, from the time of the creation of the land grant colleges in 1862 through the establishment of state experiment stations, the state extension services, the beginning of subsidies by the Weeks Act of 1911 (which made possible many of the first state forest departments), the Clarke-McNary Act and its amendments, the vocational education and rehabilitation acts of 1917 and 1920, and the national highway grants and the intimate cooperation with the state highway agencies beginning in 1918. True, the TVA has had unprecedented freedom in using its appropriations in furtherance of diverse purposes and thus possessed great opportunity to tailor-make its grants toward the ends sought. Whether or not it has always used that discretion wisely is not clear as Selznick's study suggests.[1]

The Army, too, has used its funds all over the country, and the Bureau of Reclamation in the seventeen western states. Both have promoted segmental resource developments in which they have collaborated directly and for sustained periods with local governments—flood control, conservancy, and irrigation districts, counties, and municipalities. The general practice of sharing costs and administrative activity among national, state, and local governments is not new. What is new is the assignment to a single agency of a multitude of program responsibilities, all concentrating

[1] Philip Selznick, *TVA and the Grass Roots* (University of California Press, 1949), 274 pp.

on the development and management of the resources of a single watershed region. New also was the imaginativeness with which the first board seized upon the many potential by-products of its water, land, and fertilizer program assignments so as to stimulate the states and local communities toward the lasting improvement of many public services.

Yet in this process of "partnering" there was one major respect in which (with inconsequential exceptions) the TVA did not seek or use the advice or services of the states. This is the conclusion of Elliott Roberts' monograph, *One River–Seven States,* an acute case study of the manner in which the TVA planned and carried out ten important program decisions involving the development of the Tennessee River. The cases are taken from the navigation, flood control and stream regulation, and electric power programs as these were handled in the harnessing and utilization of the river. The studies test the claims of Lilienthal and Clapp (perhaps one should say some extreme statements of those claims in which they sometimes indulged) against the claims of their severe critics, one of whom has said that the people of the valley have nothing to say about really important decisions affecting their welfare but may merely pray for the continued benevolence of their TVA board masters.

Roberts' evidence supports the conclusion that in deciding how to control the Tennessee River, where and when to build the dams, what to do about navigation facilities and the ancillary rate structures, and where and how to transmit, sell, and stimulate distribution of the electric energy welling out of the river structures, the TVA did *not* "partner" with the states save in minor particulars. This seems to warrant the caption of his concluding chapter which reads: "The Myth of Partnership." There is no space to review that evidence here. But the pungency and lucidity of the exposition, and the cogency of the data revealed, will intrigue serious students of this important subject.

But Roberts is careful to insist that despite the puncture of the myth which he thinks the facts indicate, there was *no good reason* why TVA should have shared these programs with the states. They called for large blocks of capital and a great deal of technical and managerial skill. The states were prepared to contribute nothing to the former and very little to the latter. These the national government could and did supply and the supply had to continue over the whole period as the system moved toward completion. The political-legal assistance that the states might have rendered was not needed because popular support for these programs in the valley was there without consultation, and the federal courts validated the legal assumptions justifying the river programs.

Moreover, Roberts insists that in these programs the basic premise of the statute and the TVA board was their *public* character. TVA had been created as an alternative to *private* development. This was a national purpose decision, and this the board accepted. It could not dicker with states on the major river developments and remain responsible to the Congress and the President. Now that twenty years of unilateral federal action has determined the river programs, Roberts asserts, the question of federal supremacy in this aspect of TVA's activity "has 'faded into irrelevance,' as Lilienthal put it, not as he implied, because of a state-federal partnership but because TVA control has become complete."

Yet this conclusion may obscure the possible and desirable participation of the states in tributary stream control on the Tennessee and elsewhere. Clapp recognizes a local water function in the small local flood dangers not met by the major river projects and, second, on those tributary streams where flood problems arise which do not affect appreciably the main system flood occurrences. Here, Clapp asserts, the states, localities, and private owners should stand in the foreground of the picture, while TVA aids with technical assistance and engineering data. Moreover, on many small tributary watersheds is an interlinked problem of land and water management. Here are urgent needs for physical and social repair that include stream improvements, land amendments, farm practices, and institutional changes. The partnership ideology has great relevance here and for its successful application must include, as the TVA experimental sponsorship on the Chestuee and the Beach rivers indicates, not only the state, through its diverse agencies, but local public, civic, and

private participation. The reviewer would suggest the possibility that if the social arrangements which continue to press many of these tributary watersheds toward physical and human decay are to be changed, TVA in its region must either be given broader powers of assistance than it now possesses or other federal agencies will have to share with it in the planning, leadership, and assisting role.

But the general superiority of the regional valley authority (and of TVA as its exemplar) over the traditional mode of organizing the national executive for resource management programs is affirmed by Clapp for a number of reasons over and above its intergovernmental virtues just reviewed. In summary these are:

1. The old-line agencies have special clienteles with which they must keep peace. Therefore interagency conflicts (reflecting these ties) cannot be resolved in the field but only in Washington. Thus, facts are obscured or distorted by the inescapable screening and long-distance sifting. Result: special interest groups increase their power; compromise and policy distortion ensue.

In contrast, a regional authority with many responsibilities over the whole resource front will fail unless, in the search for an integrated goal, it can resolve those conflicts within the region.

Certainly there is much truth in these strictures. But whether or not the only or best alternative is the valley authority device depends upon the possibility of rearranging and reorienting the traditional forms of executive organization. This would require that within the several regions decentralized regional multipurpose structures will be established and challenged by the need to conceive their responsibilities integrally—so to relate their several programs in their plans and recommendations as to serve the widest total regional and national interest. Because the reviewer has argued elsewhere that this is possible, he must confess that events of the past six years have moved in the opposite direction. Not only have the fissures between the operating bureaus widened, but a new disintegrating process has almost jettisoned the whole conception of comprehensive river basin development and the maximum utilization of nature's river gifts.

2. The methods used, by administrative choice or congressional requirement, in the planning, authorization, and construction of major river projects by the old-line agencies have led to long delays, gross inaccuracy of cost estimates, and greatly increased costs. They induce "political" engineering wherein technical recommendations are distorted to avoid local heat or curry congressional favor.

Against these evils Clapp sets TVA's record, asserting among its administrative merits that in the building of twenty dams and three major steam plants TVA's estimates of costs were within 0.7 per cent of the actual costs. The Douglas Dam episode, noted above, also challenges the traditional administrative construction practices.

Together these allegations and experiences suggest the need for a full-scale reexamination, unblinkered by idealogical fixations, to discover whether or in what manner the authorization, budgeting, personnel, and construction practices of the national government as applied to major resource development programs and projects should be altered in the interest of greater social returns for funds expended.

That the time is not propitious for such an inquiry by *official* agencies is underlined by the second Hoover Commission travesty in its report upon the natural resource segment of federal administrative responsibility. But when our traditional conservation policies are resumed and sanity about our national responsibilities returns, these questions must sooner or later be squarely faced.

Improving the Budgetary Process

By Frederick J. Lawton, U. S. Civil Service Commission

The Budgetary Process in the United States, by Arthur Smithies. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955. Pp. 486. $6.50.

I

In the forefront of every study of government organization, operation, and methods during the last forty years has been the question of the budget. The question has been discussed and debated from this point of view or that, from one angle or another. In his current study of the budgetary process, Professor Smithies has attacked the problem boldly, broadly, and comprehensively. He has traced its beginnings, its development; he has probed and dissected; he has also prescribed and suggested.

In setting the background for the study it is important to determine the scope of our budgetary processes, the part that is played by the Executive, by the Congress, and by the public. Where does the budget fit into the framework of government and, specifically, into the executive and legislative branches? How well or how poorly conceived are the procedures by which budgetary decisions are made? Can intelligent judgment and leadership compensate for ineffective procedures and defective organization?

The major questions posed in this study are:

> How effectively are expenditure decisions related to the policy objectives that they are intended to serve?
> How are expenditure proposals considered in relation to taxation and other elements on the cost side of the budget?
> How effective are budgetary procedures in achieving their avowed objective of economy and efficiency in the conduct of government operations? (pp. 8-9)

When the average person thinks of budgeting, he thinks of a financial expert showing the way to carry out a given program with the least amount of men, materials, and money. It is important to remember that he thinks in terms of a given program, one that has already been determined by the policy-makers or by some outside source.

We followed those traditions in the early days of our budget system but that was before federal expenditure programs and revenue needs required 20 per cent or more of our national income. Circumstances have compelled us to recognize a much closer connection between policy-making and budgeting. They have compelled us to think of budgeting as involving the "allocation of scarce resources among almost insatiable and competing demands." To do that intelligently, we must make sure that our processes and procedures are best adapted to aid in making intelligent decisions and intelligent choices among alternatives.

This study assesses the effectiveness of the processes, their strengths, their weaknesses, and presents suggestions for improvements. In the main, they center on the need to improve the processes from the point of view of efficient programing. Just as dollars proposed in the budget may represent the choice among alternatives, so the recommendations for improvement in the processes recognize that the most effective means of achieving the primary goal may lessen the ability to achieve some secondary goals.

To lay the groundwork and serve as a guidepost for the reader in reviewing the past, considering the present, and planning for the future, the central theme is stressed at the beginning of the discussion, namely, the relationship between budgeting and the process of decision-making. We can do no more than to state this concept in the language of the author:

> . . . Almost every governmental decision has budgetary implications since the process of decision-making almost invariably involves the allocation of scarce resources among alternative uses. Resources can be used privately or diverted by taxation or other methods to government use, and, if so diverted, they are allocated among a variety of government uses. A major thesis of this study is that the entire process of decision-making is improved

to the extent that these choices are made explicitly and deliberately. (p. 20)

This decision-making process is a continuing one, involving determination of policy objectives, planning, programing, budget formulation, budget (or program) execution, and review.

The political and social process through which policy objectives are determined is not dealt with at length in this study. It is sufficient to recognize that these decisions sometimes result from objectives deeply rooted in history and tradition, and sometimes are developed in response to a situation that suddenly arises and must be met. Planning, as used in the discussion, means the preparation of alternative plans that will further policy objectives in varying measure. Programing may involve the selection of one or more alternative plans. The formulation of a budget is an extension of the programing stage. It is the expression of a program in terms of a common denominator—money. It makes possible the comparison of programs one with another and with their cost in terms of taxation.

II

Following this central theme, we trace the development of the budget process in our government. From the earliest beginnings when executive control was strong, through the breakdown of that control and its transfer to the legislature, we come after a century and a quarter back toward the initial concept. The developments in fiscal administration beginning with the Taft Commission of 1911 and culminating in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 set the basic framework for an executive budget. Later legislation and reorganization plans have filled out that framework. The concept of the Executive Office of the President was, from one point of view at least, a budgetary reform. In its original concept, planning, budgeting, personnel management, and reporting were designed to be part of an effective group that would develop, finance, staff, and evaluate presidential programs. Of that group, the Planning Board and the Office of Government Reports have disappeared from the scene. The Office of Personnel Management has shifted to presidential adviser on personnel policy, and the Budget Bureau alone survives. Its original role has been somewhat modified by the Council of Economic Advisers, set up under the Employment Act of 1946, and by the greater use of the National Security Council as an advisory body on defense and foreign aid spending.

While the procedures on the executive side have been adapted to changing concepts of fiscal management, the reform on the congressional side has lagged far behind. The approach is still based on fragmentation, not only in the Congress as a whole but even within the committees. No committee of Congress has the responsibility for looking at both the revenue and the appropriation or expenditure side of the budget. The Ways and Means and Finance Committees, charged with developing revenue sources, consider expenditure totals, but their action with respect to revenue legislation may or may not bear direct relationship to those totals.

On the other hand, the Appropriations Committees, or rather their almost autonomous subcommittees, deal with their own particular subdivisions of the budget, independent not only of the revenue committees but also of their companion subcommittees. Abortive attempts have been made to require Congress to look at the budget as a whole, but even the legislative budget required under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 quickly fell into disuse. The omnibus appropriation bill, a partial gesture in that direction, was tried once and then abandoned. Proposals to develop a means of considering the budget as an entity failed of enactment. The nearest approach toward a consideration of the budget as an entity has been by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, but this committee's function is purely an advisory one.

Yet the need for improvement in budgeting is constantly felt and expressed. In dealing with the actual mechanics of budget development, we find that during two-thirds of its existence the budget has had to meet the test, not of its ability to meet the normal requirements, but rather of its flexibility to meet the rapidly changing requirements of abnormal conditions. The depression of the 30's and the consequent development of new and expand-

ing functions of government, the war and reconversion periods of the 40's, and again war conditions in the early 50's—these lead the author to believe that we have not found a pattern sufficiently flexible to meet the requirements of present-day government. We have too much built-in rigidity, too much adherence to practice and precedent, too little ability or opportunity to make considered judgments, to make reasoned choices among alternatives. The failure here is greater in the congressional consideration than in the development of the executive proposals. In part, this is due to internal organization and, in part, it stems from the fact that Congress is not a body selected with a national point of view in mind but, rather, an aggregation of sectional or local points of view. Obviously, the effect of local or regional needs or pressures must be reflected in the consideration of revenues and expenditures.

The proposals for improvement of the budgetary process both on the congressional and on the executive side attempt to take a middle road between the two extremes most clearly set forth by earlier proposals. One school of thought holds that the executive is basically irresponsible, and that only by much closer congressional supervision can proper fiscal management and economy and efficiency in operation be achieved. The alternative approach is a further strengthening of presidential staff to hold in line department heads because of their inevitable response to the pressures of their own constituencies and because of the alliances they form with congressional committees similarly motivated.

The philosophy behind the proposals for improvement in the budget process is that of achieving a change which will permit Congress, the President, and the departments all to play responsible roles in the budgetary process, but to play them within their proper areas of discretion and responsibility. The budget should be prepared and considered on a program basis in broad categories, so that it is understandable to the Congress, does not burden the Congress or the President with excessive detail, gives latitude to the departments to take the initiative in improving the efficiency of their operations, and permits of more rapid preparation and, consequently, greater flexibility. The effectiveness of performance should be reported to and considered by the Congress.

For this to be effective, it is suggested that there be much closer liaison between the Appropriations and the legislative committees. One possible means of bringing about this liaison would be to provide that the Appropriations Committees, or subcommittees thereof, would make recommendations concerning the expenditure or appropriation aspects of new legislation, and their comments would be included in the report of the legislative committee. The Appropriations Committees would likewise be permitted to propose in appropriation bills amendments to expenditure determinations contained in basic legislation, such as a reduction in the parity level of agricultural price support or in the rate of veterans' readjustment allowances.

While this is a highly interesting proposal, its effect on the membership of the Congress would be akin to placing a powder keg with a lit fuse in the middle of each legislative chamber. Currently the members of Congress occasionally rise in wrath and take the Appropriations Committees to task for infringing on the rights of the other committees of the two bodies. If the Appropriations Committees were instruments of the party in power, and if there were strong party discipline and responsibility in each House of Congress, then we might assume that, as an expression of party government, this proposal might be effective. But it is still a fact that in the Congress each legislator thinks of himself first as the representative of a sovereign state or congressional district more often than he does as a party member. Putting the Appropriations Committees in such a position of dominance would be resented and resisted by the members not serving on those committees.

To strengthen the performance review, it is suggested that the Appropriations Committees and the Committee on Government Operations should jointly review the economy and efficiency of government operations, and that this review should be based on presidential and departmental reports submitted at the beginning of the session, utilizing both staffs of the committees and the assistance of the Comptroller General. The timing of this re-

view should be at the beginning of the session so that it could be completed prior to consideration of the budget estimates.

In considering appropriation requests, the Appropriations Committees should look, first, at the budget as a whole and lay down the guidelines for their subcommittees. Because of its broad program character and the elimination of unnecessary detail, the budget could be submitted in March rather than in January, and action still completed well before the beginning of the fiscal year. Having reviewed the effectiveness of agency operations prior to the submission of the budget, the time and attention of the Appropriations Committees could be directed to the program proposals in the light of more current information as to economic conditions and revenue possibilities. This goal is a highly desirable one.

Another suggestion set forth by the author is that Congress should establish a joint budget policy committee of eighteen members, four from the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate; four from the revenue committees, Ways and Means and Finance; four from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; and six from Congress at large, the majority party controlling the committee by a preponderance of the members selected at large. The committee should have some staff of its own and be aided by the staffs of both the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue and Taxation. Its job would be to consider the fiscal policies and to propose a resolution with respect to appropriate budget policy for the year. The House and Senate should agree to adopt such a concurrent resolution before they act on the omnibus appropriation bill, and its report should show how their recommendations conform to the budget policy adopted in this resolution. These are described by the author as "modest suggestions," and would look forward to further unification of congressional budgetary procedure. This committee would act on an informal, advisory, and consultative basis rather than attempt to give specific instructions.

Again we have a desirable basis for operation, particularly because it does not set up a directive but rather a recommending group.

If we are to have adequate budget consideration by the Congress, far-reaching improvements on the executive side of the budget process must be undertaken. Not only must the form and content of the budget be improved, but the organization of the Executive Office must be geared more intelligently into production of an improved budget. To produce a meaningful and intelligible budget the objective sought is that "the President should submit to the Congress a program budget of a sufficient level of generality, but at the same time concreteness, that would permit the Appropriations Committee as a whole to consider it." (p. 199) To accomplish this will require a rather delicate balance and considerable administrative ingenuity.

The level of generality should be one that would permit the President to present an understandable program but not to burden it with detail. The specifics should be the departments' responsibility, not the President's. This type of budget should include understandable revenue as well as expenditure proposals. It should strive to show more clearly what we get for the dollars we spend. It should put programs in the perspective of their impact on the economy. It should talk in terms of the amount of work to be done. It should set forth the span of the program and its cost level.

To set the stage for this program consideration, there should be a systematic review of past performance, prepared at the direction of the Budget Bureau and reported by the President to the Congress at the beginning of the session. This would be a part of the President's discharge of his primary responsibility for effective management.

Organizationally, there should be more formal participation by the National Security Council and by the Council of Economic Advisers in the development of revenue estimates. On the departmental level, closer cooperation between program and budget staffs must be obtained if improvements in program presentation and economy and efficiency of operation are to be achieved.

III

The author divides the budget into two major classes to show the practical application of these general principles. In dealing with

the defense budget, one of the essential ingredients for improvement is the closer participation of the service secretaries in the program decisions reflected in the budget. Another is establishing more clearly what we are getting for our defense dollars. A third would require that the process be shortened if budgetary requests are to bear any realistic resemblance to subsequent expenditure programs. It is also suggested that much could be gained from disassociating a broad program budget from a more detailed "review of past performance."

Five particular problem areas in the nondefense budget are selected for discussion. They represent budgetary problems, but they likewise represent problems in other fields, such as government organization, intergovernmental relations, and political pressures. One has the feeling that in some of these it is the program itself and not the amount of money devoted to it or its budgetary aspects that really bothers the author. Likewise, the solutions to some of the problems which are suggested are based on practical politics and not on fiscal principles.

Finally, in discussing the economic impact of the budget, the author discusses several of the more common theories or rules for budgeting. The annually balanced budget is weighed and found not adequate to meet the requirements of modern government, though admittedly it goes a long way toward requiring a conscious choice among alternatives.

Basing the budget on the requirements of the national economic budget is cast aside because of doubts as to its practicability and its failure to provide any operating rule. The stabilizing budget proposed by the Committee for Economic Development, in the author's opinion, has greater merit in providing a practical rule of operation fitted to current economic conditions. The warning is clearly given that we must not expect to find any policy that can keep the budgetary process intact in extreme situations of severe depression or large-scale mobilization.

Another favorite, the capital budget, is examined objectively and found to be of little value in aiding us toward achieving better budgetary decisions.

This book makes a real contribution to the field of fiscal and budgetary administration. It covers the essential aspects of the problem, discusses them incisively and dispassionately, and poses the alternatives in a fashion that permits the reader to make an intelligent choice among them.

Report of Conference Sessions Annual Meeting of the American Society for Public Administration, 1956

THE summaries of the panel session of the annual conference of the Society, prepared by their reporters, are reproduced below.

Government and Crisis: The New England Floods

Chairman—James W. Fesler, Alfred Cowles Professor of Government, Yale University

Panel—Brigadier General Robert J. Fleming, Jr., Division Engineer, New England Division, Corps of Engineers; Stephen A. Flis, Town Manager, Farmington, Connecticut; Hubert R. Gallagher, Assistant Administrator for Field Relations, Federal Civil Defense Administration; Robert H. Marden, Chief of Plans, Massachusetts Civil Defense Agency; Carleton F. Sharpe, City Manager, Hartford, Connecticut; Lieutenant Colonel Miles Wachendorf, New England Division, Corps of Engineers

Reporter—Harry M. Scoble, Jr., Instructor in Political Science, Boston University

Farmington, Connecticut, August 18, 1955. "Connie" was wet—"Diane" wetter. Farmington River rose, requiring evacuation of 65 homes in two areas. Near midnight, waters seemed to recede: some homes were reoccupied. Midnight to 3:00 a.m., August 19, river rose again—floods began. Town Manager Flis needed boats and help.

Flis took time out, about 3:00 a.m., to call City Manager Sharpe in neighboring Hartford. There the dykes were holding—dykes built to prevent devastation such as that from the 1938 hurricane.

At this same time, the DPW chief for western Massachusetts was notifying the Berkshire Sector director of civil defense that roads had washed out. Bad news travelled on up to area director and state director. Plans long held in readiness suddenly became operational.

Red Cross and other nongovernmental groups moved in to help with immediate relief.

August 19-23, General Fleming's New England Division, Army Corps of Engineers, began the cleanup: Corps personnel were relocated in the field; experts flew in from points as distant as North Africa; spot contract negotiations were completed for using 1,200 pieces of corporate, heavy construction equipment. In Washington, FCDA oversaw the reconstruction-rehabilitation phase—releasing emergency generators from warehouse stock piles, helping expedite $1.2 billions in defense contracts for the area.

The statistician for 1955 drily records of this flood that it was the costliest in United States history in terms of property damage—estimated between $0.5 and $1.5 billions. And some 200 individuals lost their lives.

But what of the governmental response to this flood stimulus? Could some lives and some property have been saved *beforehand?* Could the "flood-fight" stage have been better, cleanup and rehabilitation better conducted? And what of "liaison" and "coordination" in a multigroup political system?

The panelists, baptized in varying degrees by these floods, reached agreement on the following points of evaluation:

1. Unpredictable disasters can be incorporated within the normal operating routines of governmental organization.

2. The human and natural resources costs of disasters can be reduced by long-range planning and by preplanning for the disaster-fighting stage.

3. The main instruments of long-range planning are (a) effective local zoning of habitation and industry "out" of the flood plain, (b) multilevel flood control projects for occu-

pied areas remaining in danger, and (c) some form of indemnification for areas damaged or destroyed.

4. Primary responsibility for the disaster-fighting stage must necessarily remain in the area with the organizations-in-being of local government, with an effective state-federal system of providing additional resources and types of equipment and supplies not available at the local level.

On this last point, more specific agreements were reached on the following aspects of preplanning:

1. There must be a predesignation of a single authority or "commander" with a single headquarters, coordinating all disaster action in the community.

2. Initial reliance will be placed upon the existing parts of local government, especially fire, police, and highway units in a flood disaster.

3. These regular municipal services must be supplemented by trained and organized volunteer units and other community resources, which must be trained to operate as a team with regular forces under the single commander.

The essential characteristics of the Civilian Emergency Plan are:

1. The creation of a civilian organization of hierarchic form.

2. The predesignation of a single commander and a single headquarters (with similarly predetermined alternative personnel and locations).

3. The establishment of an organizational chart, outlining specific duties.

4. The creation of a dual communications net, encompassing (a) a warning system (built on adjacent Weather Bureau units, local power and water-works dams, etc.) and (b) a notification system by a "fan-out" method ("each one reach one") to contact key personnel.

5. An action plan, based on (a) geographic-terrain inventory, (b) local equipment inventory (both public and private), (c) "pooled skills" inventory (e.g., is there a citizen who had comunications experience in the Army, a fireman who, in naval service, had experience with breeches buoys or bosun's chairs), and (d) agreements on allocations of relief functions with local voluntary agencies (where such exist operatively).

6. An ordinance to empower the disaster commander (a) to remove individuals—by force if necessary—from flooded or flood-threatened areas, (b) to declare a local emergency (thus, e.g., to extend workmen's compensation coverage to off-duty personnel, etc.), and (c) to authorize and appropriate relief and rehabilitation funds (perhaps to a set percentage of the grand list).

In addition, local authorities must be prepared to meet, and exclude, sightseers and to assist residents in making the transition from relief to meaningful participation. At levels above this, the major requirements are for an organization-in-being that can coordinate materiel-personnel requests and can facilitate financial assistance.

Certain questions remained unanswered, however. For one, these generalizations were based on flood experiences for which, for example, areal (river basin) organization *may* be most appropriate; but would it be appropriate for other forms of natural disaster (e.g., earthquakes or tornadoes)?

Because of the predictability of the emotional response of most Americans and the lack of predictability of extent of disaster, post-disaster operations will remain initially non-bureaucratized and without regard to cost.

Other problems remain: should the disaster commander be an elective official or a prestige (or other) opinion leader? Will training and "wet runs" maintain the morale of the key personnel of a "ghost" disaster agency that must remain in the wings until cued by the disaster? How is it possible to overcome the problem that Civil Defense verges on suspended animation except in those areas already hit once or more by disaster? Is Civil Defense the proper agency, or a military organization (with its superior training, experience, manpower, equipment, and command)? If the latter, can it be subjected to democratic controls? at the state and local levels?

Also, at the local level, the influences of interests and politics may be increased rather than decreased by the disaster impact (e.g., a

new line-up of flooded versus unflooded members of the Merchants Association), publicity-conscious voluntary relief organizations may fight for the right to succor flood victims. These and other problems stemming from having to deal with people rather than objects may be recognized—but not necessarily resolved.

Decision-Making in Large Organizations

Chairman—Morton Grodzins, Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago

Opening Speaker—Herbert A. Simon, Head, Department of Industrial Management, Carnegie Institute of Technology

Panel—William T. Golden, Chairman of Executive Committee, National-U.S. Radiator Corporation; Dillon S. Myer, Executive Director, Group Health Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., formerly Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior; Fred L. Strodtbeck, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago, currently engaged in a study of jury decision-making

Reporter—Herbert Kaufman, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Yale University

Mr. Simon, while noting that administrative situations range from repetitive tasks (like mail-sorting) to the broadest kinds of decisions of boards of directors (often involving millions of dollars), explicitly confined himself to decisions of a nonroutine character. Equally explicitly, he disavowed any intention to restrict himself to the formal aspects of organization, the organization-chart kind of analysis; rather, he concerned himself with the stable patterns of behavior and of relationships that develop in the course of efforts to accomplish any task or series of related tasks.

In the study of these phenomena, he said, three approaches to problems of organization, and of evaluating reorganization, have emerged. One is from the approach of efficiency—a criterion that has proved useful in studying and improving well-established, repetitive activities, but that is not very helpful above the routine level. The second is more useful for analyzing nonrepetitive situations; this is the power (measured in terms of influence upon the substance of decisions) of the individuals and groups who participate in the decision-making process. The third encompasses the morale, the attitudes, the happiness or satisfaction of all the people in the organization—the "human relations" point of view. All three have contributed to our understanding of organization behavior.

But they do not provide a complete picture, for they neglect what Mr. Simon suggested may be viewed as a fourth approach, though it is still in rough form and in need of development and refinement: how do particular problems and issues come to the attention of organization leaders? Why are particular questions selected for consideration and for decision rather than others? In Simon's researches at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, it has sometimes been possible to predict the outcome of a process of deliberation—i.e., the substance of a decision under discussion—once the subject of discussion was chosen by the decision-makers, but there is little in the literature on administration to indicate how any subject is picked out of the vast array of possible subjects and how it comes to the leaders' attention. A line of inquiry designed to shed light on these processes might well prove to be a very fruitful avenue for research in organization behavior; it would *certainly* be of value to *administrators* to find out what they must do to administrative structure in order to make their organizations sensitive to those changes in conditions that require planning and preparation, to ensure that all the possible solutions are worked out, and to maximize the probability that appropriate solutions will be adopted and acted upon. Thus, for example, since there is a "Gresham's law of planning"—namely, most human beings will avoid long-range planning if they can find any excuse to devote their energies instead to immediate, operating responsibilities—the structural response should be to separate planners from administrators. (However, this raises a new problem to which attention must then be given—the problem of getting action on plans.)

Mr. Myer, commenting from the point of view of a government administrator, agreed on the need for planning and for separating planners from line administrators, but he expressed

some reservations about the effectiveness of manipulating organization structure as a way of securing appropriate planning. At policy-making levels, it is more useful to get the right people in the right places, to define responsibility, and to maintain clear lines of communication than to seek after "the" right structure. Given these three conditions, the details of structure are not so important; problems will be avoided or solved in any event.

Mr. Golden, bringing to bear the attitude of a businessman, went beyond Mr. Myer's position, contending that the personality of a decision-maker is a more important factor in the decision-making process than is organization structure. Personality was intended broadly to include qualities of temperament, intellect, and experience. There is, he said, a law of inertia applicable to organization—no decision will issue unless some force (external or internal) compels it; very often this force is the personality of the decision-maker. To demonstrate his point, he cited the case of a mining and manufacturing firm that had had four presidents in two decades, and in which, in each instance, it was the resultant of forces of the personalities of one or a very few members of the board of directors that determined the changes in the executive.

Mr. Strodtbeck, representing the social science research point of view, cautioned that the term "personality," as used in public administration, often hides more than it reveals. It is experimentally possible to demonstrate that when a policy decision results in successful adaptation, the persons within an organization who favored that decision enjoy a rise in status and a greater latitude to influence policy in the future. If one enlarges the perspective for analysis so that the system of interrelations within and outside of an organization is taken into account, many of the factors which have previously been conceived of as residing in the personality of a particular executive may be seen to be the product of organization, orientation toward rules, congruence of career expectations and assignments, and so simple a matter as the state of the market. The particular weakness of the concept of personality as applied to an executive is that it orients research backward into earlier experience of the executive. If a capacity for new and original ideas is a trait under consideration it is probably more meaningful to look at the present social-business associations of the executive than his past experience. So long as it is believed that executive personality is the most important characteristic of a successful enterprise, other aspects of scientific administrative analysis may be slighted. The theoretical challenge facing students of administration is the development of a conceptual system which will encompass simultaneously the dimensions of adaptive success, power, and morale. When this is done, "executive personality" will most surely be accorded a more modest position than it now holds.

Mr. Grodzins suggested that there were wide areas of agreement among the members of the panel despite their differences of opinion. The panelists seemed to him to concur on the advisability of having an organization unit specializing in developing and evaluating new ideas, since, by this structural device, new ideas will be brought to the attention of the administrator. But if the administrator lets himself become involved in a mass of details, even a vast flow of new ideas will not stimulate action; personality factors cannot be ignored. It is through a proper blend of organizational design and personality considerations that the best results are obtained and that an appropriate span of administrative sensitivity to the needs and opportunities for innovation—an element at least as important as the span of control—is developed.

The Management of Large Cities

Chairman—Lennox L. Moak, Director, Bureau of Municipal Research and Pennsylvania Economy League (Eastern Division), Philadelphia

Panel—Luther Gulick, President, Institute of Public Administration, New York City, formerly City Administrator, New York City; David McGuire, Chief Administrative Officer, City of New Orleans; Vernon D. Northrop, Executive Vice President, Food Distribution Center, Philadelphia, formerly Managing Director, City of Philadelphia

Reporter—Estal E. Sparlin, Director, The

Cleveland Bureau of Governmental Research

Chairman Moak was in a strategic position to plan and chair this discussion. He had a significant part in drafting the 1951 Philadelphia Home Rule Charter which provides for a managing director. Just as this charter was being completed, he was engaged as consultant in the preparation of the charter for New Orleans, where he had previously been director of the New Orleans Bureau of Governmental Research for a number of years. He was also director of finance for Philadelphia during the first two years of the new regime there.

The chairman pointed out that the larger cities of the United States, with the exception of Cincinnati, have not embraced the city manager plan and that little had been done to provide significant administrative assistance to the mayor except the creation of the office of chief administrator in San Francisco in 1933 and Louisville's establishment of a principal administrative officer by contract in 1948. The 1951 Philadelphia charter introduced a four-member cabinet, one of whom—the managing director—represented a new level of public officer. New Orleans followed in the charter adopted in 1952 with a chief administrative officer, and the Gulick Commission brought forth the creation of a city administrator for New York City in 1954.

The panel addressed itself to a discussion of the contribution of these new devices to improved management in these cities, rather than to a theoretical discourse on whether a new form of city government was emerging or the relative merits of the city manager and mayor-council forms in large cities.

Mr. McGuire warned that it was "too early to reach any definitive conclusions on how the New Orleans plan is working." The mayor has been given a *modus operandi* for conserving and making better use of his own time. Through one person, the mayor is better able to function as the trigger mechanism to set off a chain reaction of activity without exhausting all of his own time and energy. The existence of the chief administrative officer to handle detailed administrative matters makes it possible for the mayor to spend more of his time and thought on big community problems.

In New Orleans, where the CAO appoints the department heads under him, Mr. McGuire believes that this command relationship "is helpful in establishing at the outset who is the boss. . . . The command relationship also is useful when a key official is not performing and is disinterested or passively resistant to suggestion or persuasion." The fact that the mayor of New Orleans has sufficient confidence in the CAO to have him serve as the administration spokesman before the Council has tended to place the CAO in the public eye and give him a status and prestige that would seldom, if ever, be accorded a secretary or even an executive assistant.

Mr. McGuire listed eleven specific fields in which his office had brought about improvement, including budgeting, planning, Council relations, internal reporting, employee morale, training, and complaints procedures.

He concluded that the CAO concept of management channeling is not a panacea or solution for all problems. It is still an experiment in government; its successful operation depends in large part on the individuals who occupy the posts of mayor and CAO; and the biggest unanswered question is how to maintain continuity of good management with changes of administration.

The New Orleans experiment may not lend itself to scientific conclusions about the contribution of the CAO because the new charter made another and perhaps more important shift in the form of government at the same time that the CAO was established, namely, the shift from a commission to a mayor-council form.

Mr. Northrop pointed out that the new charter of Philadelphia provided a major reorganization of the administrative structure of the city. Top management under the mayor now consists of a cabinet composed of the director of finance, the city representative, the city solicitor, and the managing director. The managing director, with appointment and supervisory control over the ten large operating departments, might be classified as somewhat similar to a city manager; however, he does not exercise control over the planning, finance, and personnel organization which have a vital relationship to both program and administra-

tive management within the ten departments for which he exercises line authority.

Mr. Northrop felt that operations during the first four years under the charter have been remarkably successful but it is difficult to assess how much of this success has been due to the personalities and capabilities of the participants and how much to the effectiveness of the structural concept of organization.

He felt there are major structural weaknesses in the organization prescribed by the charter. First, there is a basic problem of the relationship between the mayor and the managing director, since many problems related to the ten operating departments come directly to the mayor and there is a great tendency for the mayor's office to handle part if not all of these problems by dealing directly with the department head. Second, there is an unresolved problem of the responsibility of the managing director for all activities of the ten operating departments and the independent responsibilities of the director of finance, the city solicitor, and the director of personnel for fiscal, legal, and personnel matters which have a vital relationship to the activities of the ten operating departments. Third, the structure fails to provide adequate mechanisms for program coordination in all those phases of planning and programing which involve areas both inside and outside the areas under the supervision of the managing director. Examples are housing, urban blight, traffic and transportation, and capital program planning.

Mr. Northrop pointed out that he was in office the last year of a four-year term of Mayor Clark and that in some ways he was performing a "holding" function until a new mayor could be elected. Thus he merely tried to continue the operations of his predecessor regardless of any ideas he might have had of how the office should operate. He felt that it was a serious defect in the plan to have the term of the managing director expire at the end of the mayor's term.

The adoption of the new Philadelphia charter was one phase of what might be designated a major revolution in that city's government which also included the election of a Democrat as mayor for the first time in sixty-seven years. "It may be said that the challenge of a new and vital reform government, the hiring of qualified people without regard to residence or politics, and the *esprit de corps* of top management were major contributing factors in the success of this operation."

The city administrator in New York City, according to Mr. Gulick, can only be understood against the background of the total governmental structure. New York City is one of the few "great governments" of the world. With a budget nearly $2 billion and some 230,000 employees, the administrative structure at City Hall must be looked on as a general management center of a large holding company, and the individual departments must be considered as operating subsidiaries. Any one of the larger departments of New York City is as large as the entire government of most other big cities. In such a system, principles of good management require the department heads to be the "city managers," and the elected mayor, with the Board of Estimate, becomes the administrative center of general direction, dealing particularly with broad policy determination, design and authorization of new programs, finance, public relations, interagency arrangements, the selection of top personnel, and corporate relations particularly with superior governments at the policy level.

The city administrator is a new high-level assistant to the mayor, in the Office of the Mayor, to aid him in the discharge of these functions of top management. The mayor does not and should not exercise "daily supervision." Consequently the city administrator does not and should not exercise such supervision. The mayor does exercise broad policy supervision as enumerated above; and does rely on the city administrator to aid him particularly in designing and reviewing new programs, developing top-level interdepartmental solutions and cooperation, disposing of major departmental administrative questions in accordance with the mayor's determined policies, seeking out top managerial personnel, establishing and maintaining central administrative reporting for the mayor, and serving as liaison with the major civic organizations and official advisory committees.

In the "chain of command," the city administrator acts under the authority of the mayor,

and where necessary passes on the orders of the mayor.

A most useful innovation in the New York structure is the Mayor's Management Cabinet. This is composed, not of the heads of the operating departments, but of the mayor's chief management officers, including the deputy mayor, the city administrator, the director of the budget, the director of planning, the director of personnel, the head of the Law Department, and the mayor's top executive assistants, including his public relations officer. This cabinet meets weekly to discuss an agenda drawn up by the city adminstrator who serves as the cabinet secretariat. The mayor makes many decisions in cabinet, determines priorities for action, and indicates who shall do what and when.

The new pattern in New York City is not a "new form" of city government. New York is still the "strong mayor with board of estimate" type of government. But the mayor, under the new structure is, according to Mr. Gulick, now being given the modern tools of central management which his legal and political status requires.

Administrative Responsibility

Chairman—Wallace S. Sayre, Professor of Public Administration, Columbia University

Opening Speaker—Arch T. Dotson, Assistant Professor of Government, Cornell University

Panel—O. W. Campbell, City Manager, San Diego, California; Nathan D. Grundstein, Professor of Political Science, Wayne University; Norton E. Long, Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University; Arnold Miles, Chief, Government Organization Branch, U.S. Bureau of the Budget

Reporter—Sidney Baldwin, Instructor in Political Science, Northwestern University

Mr. Dotson constructed five basic approaches which, in his view, characterize the existing literature dealing with the idea of administrative responsibility: (1) conservative reaction; (2) the rule of law; (3) executive supremacy; (4) corporate objectivity; and (5) legislative supremacy.

"Conservative reaction" is based on the belief that the traditional devices by which the governed control the governors are in decay, that the popular spirit of freedom is dissolving, and that administrators, assisted by organized special interests, have been engaged in a conspiracy to undermine the legislative branch of government. The rise of bureaucracy has thus created the problem of administrative responsibility. The prescription is to pour government back into its former mold through the assumption by the legislature of its former duties and functions, reduction of public expendit res and administrative personnel, prohibition of further administrative growth, encouragement of greater tax-consciousness among the people, and return to state and local governments of powers which have been "bartered" or "stolen" from them. Thus, administrative responsibility can be achieved only through destruction of the bureaucracy and abolition of the policies and popular beliefs on which bureaucratic government is built.

The "rule of law" approach, also starting from the conspiracy theory of bureaucracy, is based on a concept of social and political balance in which the system of checks and balances and separation of powers is the major defense against the dangers of arbitrary power. Due process is the criterion for all governmental actions involving private rights. Administrative responsibility exists only where the rule of law prevails, where there is a separation of powers, due process, availability of judicial review, and where other judicial rules prevail. All of these vital elements are being overthrown, as the "administrative regime" supplants the traditional "judicial regime." Only where administration is carefully controlled and limited can responsibility be achieved. Consequently, the prescription is to impose judicial rules of procedure upon the bureaucracy.

The "executive supremacy" approach also sees the problem of administrative responsibility as resulting from violation of the principle of separation of powers. The chief executive is conceived as a "general manager of the United States," in conformity with the principles of sound administrative management. Where the tenets of effective management are vio-

lated, there can be no responsibility. In this view, responsibility is respect for the hierarchy of authority, or "organized obligation." The prescription is administrative reform.

Rejecting the conspiratorial theory of bureaucracy, "corporate objectivity" considers the traditional mechanisms as inadequate in their modern setting. The doctrine of separation of powers is impracticable and there can be no clear separation between politics and administration. Modern bureaucracy has arisen to satisfy the need created by the incapacity of legislatures to perform their traditional tasks effectively in a complicated society. Administrative responsibility is viewed as an ambivalent concept. In performing his tasks, the administrator may be guided by "political responsibility" in issues that are not susceptible to popular understanding and judgment and where no scientific standards prevail. In those activities where scientific standards may be applied, he may be guided by "objective responsibility." The former may be politically enforced while the latter is enforceable only by fellow specialists with competence—"the fellowship of science." Political responsibility can be secured through the application of traditional methods of political and hierarchical controls, while objective responsibility can be achieved only through the creation of a more favorable climate within which a bureaucracy that is "self-conscious as a responsible partner in the democratic system" can exist. In view of the historic trends, however, the primary key to "objective responsibility" is administrative self-control.

"Legislative supremacy" has arisen in response to "corporate objectivity." Based on the traditional concept of the political process, it accepts the view that the will of the people has content and that the legislature has the central role—constitutionally authorized—in translating the general interest into law. The special function of Congress is derived from its representative, elective, and deliberative character. Congress is chosen by the people; it represents the people; and it is appropriately the voice of the people. The bureaucracy, on the other hand, is "inherently specialist, hierarchical, and autonomous" in character, with no authority to formulate policy, define the general interest, or make law. Administrative responsibility from this point of view is based on the maintenance of a clear line of obligation within the bureaucracy, running ultimately to the legislature, and it can be achieved only by the legislature determining and enforcing the direction and boundaries of the administrators' obligations. The prescription is legislative reform and integration of legislative and executive branches of government, in order to "cement" the control of the elected representatives over administration. According to Dotson, "the condition sought is no less than the unambiguous, external, and objective subservience of the bureaucracy."

Mr. Dotson has concluded that these approaches are all inadequate because they are based on misconceptions of the problem, which in reality is a problem of power. He argued that they largely fail to appreciate "the variety and effectiveness of administrative participation" in the policy process. "Conservative reaction," for example, correctly recognizes the legislature's loss of control over the bureaucracy, but errs in interpreting this loss as a result of a bureaucratic conspiracy to overturn the political order and in prescribing regression to an idyllic condition of laissez faire. The "rule of law" correctly interprets the capacity of administrators to affect individual rights, but in prescribing rules of procedure it addresses only a portion of the problem. The "rule of law does not reach the substance of administrative power" and the proposals for administrative reorganization and judicial review ignore the realities of modern government. Exponents of "executive supremacy," on the other hand, have a greater understanding of administrative management than of the political process, and their proposals come not from the body of political knowledge but from an O & M handbook. Those who subscribe to "corporate objectivity" correctly describe the problem, but in perceiving two aspects of responsibility they create more problems than they solve, for they offer few clues to the administrator who must apply the dual concept. Finally, the "legislative supremacy" approach, in subscribing to the ideal of "the mastership of the public," is deeply rooted in democratic theory, but the

proponents of this approach are too optimistic in prescribing the juggling of legislative committees as a cure-all. More important, the absence of party discipline in the legislature is a weakness which would contribute to political recklessness rather than administrative responsibility.

During the discussion, Mr. Sayre noted the failure to take into account the work of those who are not neatly classified by Mr. Dotson's categories. Mr. Sayre was specifically critical of the statement of the "executive supremacy" approach which he found to be little more than caricature, based on a misconception of the nature of the Presidency and ignoring much of the historical record of the "executive supremacy" approach. Furthermore, he suggested that "Mr. Dotson has presented a series of Hobson's choices, but has not revealed Dotson's choice."

Mr. Long believed that Mr. Dotson's analysis failed to develop the concept of administrative responsibility in terms that might contribute to greater understanding, and he expressed the fear that the five basic approaches might lead to a slot-machine approach to responsibility. He would prefer that the discussion be conducted in terms of behavior rather than remain preoccupied with the "notion of legitimacy." He urged that we see the "responsiveness" in responsibility and that we define what it is that we want administrators to be responsive or responsible to. We want bureaucrats to have minds of their own, he suggested, and to present alternatives to the legislature. We ought not to deal with the problem "metaphysically" and we should cease using the term "administrative responsibility" as a slogan.

Mr. Campbell found the five basic approaches neither realistic nor mutually exclusive, and he criticized the analysis for its failure to conceive of power in operational terms. Mr. Miles, on the other hand, considered Mr. Dotson's "search for a single solution" to be doomed to failure and he suggested that much was lost by the failure to distinguish between sound theory in each of the approaches and weak or unsound methods in their application.

Mr. Grundstein, in a written critique, suggested that clues to a better understanding of administrative responsibility lie in some of the literature that the analysis had ignored. In analyzing existing literature, however, "it is of less importance that other writers may be wrong, than that the exposure of their errors should point to the correct insights." With respect to the "rule of law" approach in particular, he suggested that it is pointless to charge the courts with "political irresponsibility," for they were not designed to be politically responsible, and he maintained that the courts were justified in insisting on the proof of administrative expertness in technical matters through the requirement of adequate supporting evidence and findings of fact. Citing the inadequacies of the term "administrative responsibility" as a research concept, Mr. Grundstein saw the term not as a statement of a problem but as an "inchoate phrase" which offers little guidance for the collection of data or for a more systematic examination of the governmental process.

During the question period, the observation was made that the analysis and discussion of administrative responsibility had been entirely culture bound. Perhaps more meaningful and fruitful concepts might develop from a broader approach which would embrace non-Western governmental systems. In response, Mr. Sayre proposed this as a suitable topic for a panel at the next annual conference.

Decision-Making in Intergovernmental Programs

Chairman—G. Lyle Belsley, Consultant to the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration

Panel—Ernest A. Engelbert, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles; Raymond M. Hilliard, Director, Department of Welfare, Cook County, Illinois; Edward A. Lutz, Professor of Public Administration, Cornell University; Charles I. Schottland, Commissioner of Social Security, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Thomas J. S. Waxter, Director, Department of Public Welfare, Maryland

Reporter—Ruth Baumann, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin

Recognizing that the problems of intergov-

ernmental relations are plentiful and varied, discussion focused largely on the decision-making process in the field of public welfare.

Federal grant-in-aid programs involve cooperative federal-state-local relations. Without clear delineation of responsibility it is difficult to develop the teamwork that is necessary in cooperative programs. Moreover, the interpretation of any problem depends upon each level. This makes it imperative that each member of the team knows what is expected of each participant. However, the problems of intergovernmental relations look different when viewed from the federal level downward and from the county-local level upward.

From the county level it sometimes appears that the state is an intervening barrier. In one case the state may take the position that the state welfare department should blast the local administrations so as to keep them on their toes. In another case the state may take the position that the county and state administrations should be on opposite sides of the fence. In both cases cooperation is negated.

The break point in decision-making depends upon the function and upon the degree of professional development at any particular level. To some extent it depends upon whether one is dealing with forests or with people.

Can the break point in welfare be determined? The break point may not be so obscure in view of the fact that decisions at the federal level have to be made on the basis of federal laws. The state has to make every decision to insure that the program is in effect throughout the state. This, however, leaves a wide area of potential disagreement and overlap. These areas of disagreement might be more easily resolved if the objectives, or end results, of programs were taken into account. For example, might it not be easier for all levels to achieve the goal of taking care of the needy and restoring them to self-support if Congress took a look at the question of just what decisions should be made by the national government in developing a program such as welfare?

Another consideration in locating the break point relates to the attitudes of state administrations toward a welfare program. In some states, leaving the details of administration to the lowest level possible provides the break point. The state lays down broad policies. In other states, this break point in welfare administration might lead to chaos. In decisions regarding individual cases, the county units resent interference from above. From the point of view of the federal agency, however, it may be necessary to have federal laws and regulations that will guarantee the same treatment to everyone under the aid program. If the states are to receive aid, then the states must meet their responsibilities under the federal laws. They must meet the policy determinations and objectives as set forth in the laws.

The degree of responsibility given to the states by Congress may depend upon the amount of experience the country has had with a particular kind of program. The amount of experience determines the extent to which the administrator will be allowed to implement the law, or improvise procedures. If we have had some previous experience, the federal law may be more general, leaving it to the states to carry out the intent of the law. The attitudes and sophistication of the people in each area determine the extent to which they are able to carry out the program without close supervision or control.

If the federal government lays down the rule that the state must have certain standards, where does the authority of the federal government stop and the state's start? From the federal administrator's point of view, the federal government should establish as few regulations as possible. This is a difficult criterion to follow in welfare, however, where the appraisal and effectiveness of a program cannot be measured easily.

Obviously everyone would agree that federal decisions with respect to the states, or state decisions with respect to the local areas, should be made with regard to someone else's views. Under what circumstances, however, would a federal decision be made without consulting state officials? Are there any circumstances so clearly defined that consultation is no longer necessary? In some cases the federal government will not make a decision without consultation with the states. Sometimes the state acts merely as the agent of the federal government. The federal agency has to be sensitive to Congress, for it has its own objectives which may

differ from the objectives of the various states. Generally, the element of consultation is a plus factor in decision-making and in the development of rules and programs.

To what extent has there been federal consultation with state executives—governors, budget officers—as contrasted with the welfare people? The federal agency frequently consults with them; but this raises difficult problems. Some feel it would be unwise for the federal government agency to establish a series of contacts outside the state agency responsible for administration of the program. There are times when consultation with a Governor, budget director, and state program administrator may be necessary—when the state gets out of conformity, or when a new program is inaugurated. Others feel that exclusive functional relationships contribute to the fragmenting of state government and tend to undermine the authority of the Governor and even the legislature.

Is there any way in the welfare field to make grants-in-aid under terms, or under a system, that would relieve the federal government of the responsibility for making a lot of decisions and fix the decision-making process? It has been suggested that the four public assistance grants be combined into one. This would be difficult, and it is doubtful whether Congress would agree to it, for political reasons. From the federal point of view, if there is enough interest to set up a grant-in-aid, the grant should not be general, without standards and regulations. From the state point of view there is much validity for federal standards, since within a state they protect the standards in wealthier cities as against the standards in poorer areas. As long as there are categorical grants, a congressional decision, they have a national purpose. As long as they exist, the problems of decision-making will overlap and areas of roughness will increase.

If there were a way to get a block grant, this would be wise within limits; yet historically and politically this is demonstrated to be difficult. In the categorical aids there must be well defined areas which are no longer subject to negotiations between federal and state governments. The law is specific. If there were a block grant, saying generally that the money must be used for needy people, the difficulties of administration would be increased.

Do federal agencies tend to intrude? Are state officials similar offenders—intruding or abusing? In public assistance, the most important decisions are determinations of eligibility in individual cases. A device for scrutinizing such decisions is the case review. The federal government has learned to use this device properly and constructively. Some states use it to obstruct local administration. In some instances case reviews have been used to discredit local administration, becoming serious sources of friction. Using this device in a punitive way, a harassment of local administration, might become infectious.

The case review technique has not been explored to the fullest as a device to educate the public or in federal-state-local relations. Over time, a common-law body of precedent might be established in which the public would come to regard the case review as a tool somewhat like the fiscal audit, with the professional welfare worker as a resource of knowledge that can be relied upon in making the review. The state of Maine is trying to establish precedents in setting performance standards against which progress can be measured.

Effective Management Staff Work in Large Organizations

Chairman—Thomas D. Morris, Resident Partner, Cresap, McCormick and Paget

Panel—Charles G. Ellington, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary, U. S. Department of Defense; Earl T. Helsel, Assistant Controller, Equitable Life Assurance Society; Carlisle H. Humelsine, Executive Vice President, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.; Hirst Sutton, Assistant Chief, Office of Management and Organization, U. S. Bureau of the Budget

Reporter—Carl F. Stover, Administrative Analyst, Office of Budget and Finance, U. S. Department of Agriculture

The proper use of a management staff is an important challenge to line executives in large organizations. In the face of numerous, complex problems, they need expert assistance in

planning, conducting research, establishing standards and procedures, and investigating performance. Staff aides are essential in preparing background information and recommendations that can serve as the basis for sound decisions.

The panel approached the subject in terms of six key questions.

1. *What are the qualifications of effective staff men?*

Mr. Helsel outlined five requirements for staff personnel, on which the panel generally agreed. These included *initiative* in seeking information and finding problems that require attention, *natural curiosity, analytical ability, mature judgment,* and those *personality attributes* that are helpful in selling ideas.

In discussing the development of a staff unit, Mr. Humelsine counseled strongly against the use of management analyst positions for the purpose of getting incompetent personnel out of the way. Good staff work requires talented and devoted persons, who have, as Mr. Helsel noted, the endurance to withstand pressures and temptations to lower performance standards.

2. *What kind of training stimulates the development of staff competence?*

Job apprenticeship training is the most practical approach to developing staff competence, according to Mr. Helsel. The man drawn from within the organization has an initial advantage in terms of greater acceptance and greater knowledge of organization programs. However, the outsider brings greater freshness in his approach and is equally suitable, if he has the requisite analytical skill and personality.

Mr. Morris mentioned the findings of professional psychologists, who have studied the characteristics of staff men. These studies indicate that "productive thinking" or "problem solving" skill is more important than intelligence level and other characteristics. Thus, training should be devoted to the development of the problem solving habit. Studies of successful management consulting assignments indicate that there is a discipline which is acquired by successful problem solvers. This discipline involves systematic application of the following steps in any survey:

a. Thoroughgoing planned collection of pertinent facts;

b. skillful definition of the problem(s) to be solved;

c. identification of the causes of these problems;

d. definition of the objectives to be met by workable, timely, and salable solutions;

e. design of alternative solutions in principle (i.e., in broad outline);

f. testing of all solutions in principle, in order to narrow down to that one which will prove the most workable, timely, and salable;

g. design of the solution in detail;

h. preparation of training and installation materials and participation, as requested, in actual installation.

3. *How should management staffs be organized in large organizations?*

The speakers agreed that staff units should be located in positions that permit freedom of movement in the organization and close contact with its operating problems.

Mr. Helsel felt that this could best be accomplished by placing qualified staffs at each significant level of management and encouraging professional communication among them, from level to level. The same point of view was presented by Mr. Humelsine, who stressed the idea that staffs should be placed directly under a senior line official, who can focus the staff on major problems. This arrangement would also help to ensure that line officials recognize the importance of the management staff and its work. Mr. Sutton added the thought that even though management staff were appropriately established at different organization locations and levels, the place to start organizing for management staff work was in the department head's office, providing at least one able aide who could assure that management staff work was closely associated with the department head's objectives and was organizationwide in its scope.

Mr. Ellington expressed the view that large organizations may require greater specialization among members of the management staff, though they may not require proportionally larger staff units. Mr. Sutton, to the contrary, argued that the management staff at high

levels in large organizations needs a greater number of persons with generalist rather than specialist skills.

4. *What are the most effective techniques for planning and conducting management staff studies?*

The main problem discussed here was that of ensuring that staff studies are conducted on problems needing attention. Mr. Helsel suggested that careful planning of the staff program was the key to success in this regard. In his opinion, the management staff should be brought into regular contact with the organization through the review of changes in organization, procedures, forms, regulations, and related items. He also stressed the desirability of a periodic management audit, which could provide continuity of work for the management staff and give them leads to needed special studies. Mr. Sutton urged the need for a flexible program, guided by the top executive and directed toward producing information needed as a basis for sound management decisions. In Mr. Helsel's view, this approach held the danger that staff investigations would become a cause for special concern by operating personnel and that resistance would develop to them.

The concept of "completed staff work," a doctrine better understood by military than by civilian organizations, was emphasized by Mr. Ellington. He believes the principles of good staff work to be the same in all organizations, although their application may require a different emphasis in different situations. In large organizations, for example, there is a relatively greater need for follow-up and inspection and for advance planning, in order to provide time for securing essential clearances and approvals.

5. *How should the results of management staff studies be used by top management?*

The degree to which the results of staff studies are used is the measure of the success of the staff and the management, according to Mr. Helsel. Where results are not used, there is a need for either a new staff or a new management.

The panel generally agreed that staff findings must be dramatized in order to secure the adoption of improvements in management. Staff recommendations must be sold—a task somewhat easier in industry than in government, because the need for profits tends to be more compelling than the need to save allotted funds.

6. *Are there significant differences between government and private industry in any of these respects?*

Although some differences can be identified, none of them seem to be of major significance, in Mr. Humelsine's view. He identified four principal differences which deserve attention:

a. Industry has the benefit of measure and control through sales and profit, whereas government is dependent upon budgetary limitations;

b. organization and personnel changes are easier to introduce in the industrial situation. Thus, industry is more apt to seize upon innovations and is willing to experiment and change rapidly. Government's processes of change are more laborious, owing in large part to the need for constant checks and rechecks before taking action;

c. bad staff work may have more serious repercussions in private industry because of this more rapid adoption. Poor staff work can lead to serious results more quickly;

d. undoubtedly, staff people are more liberally compensated in industry than in government.

Mr. Ellington suggested that the government faces special difficulties because of its personnel policies. There is a lack of continuity in top executive positions, which creates continual problems of orientation and adjustment. For this reason, and also because of the regular shifting of personnel between agencies, the executive is likely to know little about his subordinates. In contrast, the business executive will often have staff personnel with whom he is closely acquainted by reason of longer association and more personal selection and promotion procedures.

Executive Leadership Through the State Budget

Chairman—Robert F. Steadman, Chairman, Department of Political Science, Wayne University

Panel—Gladys M. Kammerer, Professor of Political Science, University of Kentucky; Glendon A. Schubert, Jr., Associate Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University; Harry G. Smith, Budget Director, State Budget Commission, Florida; Maurice F. Williams, Administrative Assistant to the Governor, Maine.

Reporter—Edith K. Mosher

The members of the panel directed their comments to the manner in which the budgets of their states were affected by the policies and programs of the Governor and to the significance of the budgetary process in the formation of public policy. They also briefly examined the role of the budget office with respect to budget execution and to management improvement in the state government.

Mr. Steadman pointed out that the fiscal role of the state is a key one yet has been relatively invisible when contrasted with the attention given to the national government or to the cities. The states have in common some administrative handicaps which arise from the nature of their legislatures or from inadequate staffing, but it is hard to generalize about state budgeting. The states vary tremendously in such aspects as the organization of the executive branch, their resources, the rationality of their revenue structures, and the relative emphasis given to different state functions. Budget staffs vary widely in size and competency.

Yet there are signs that the concept of executive leadership is reaching the states as "something new"; and stimulated by developments in national government and in industry, recognition is growing that the budget provides a potential tool for the state's executive. A budget may be dynamic when it is conceived of as a plan, the embodiment of a recognized need for change and adjustment.

Miss Kammerer stated that the Governor of Kentucky has strong legal powers over the budget. In 1936, legislation was enacted for central budget control over approximately 60 per cent of the state's revenues, but it was inoperative until 1948. Under Governor Clements, a budget staff was recruited and by 1951 was able to initiate performance budgeting. Since Governor Chandler was elected last year, however, he has by-passed the Division of the Budget and used budget slashes as a means of settling scores with political rivals.

She illustrated the relationship between a public policy issue and budget administration by recounting the efforts of a citizens' group to obtain improved treatment of patients in mental hospitals. They became convinced that the additional appropriations they sought would be wasted unless hospital budget procedures were improved. When they made no progress on this score with the incumbent welfare commissioner, they sought a new Department of Mental Health and obtained the Governor's support. By 1952, a competent psychiatrist-administrator had been recruited and appropriations for a greatly expanded program obtained.

In some departments the Kentucky budget staff has been able to follow up on the projected program, but it has found that one of the better managed departments has been least cooperative. Miss Kammerer felt that the position of the budget office was an admirable one for rendering assistance if it was desired. Where it is resisted, obtaining entree poses a delicate problem.

Mr. Schubert stated that, as in Kentucky, modern budgeting began in Michigan in 1948 when the Department of Administration was created by statute. A number of related fiscal and control activities, including budgeting, were grouped under a controller. Noting the marked difference in the operations of four controllers, he listed four relevant variables: the Governor, his basic administrative philosophy, the role taken by the controller, and the staffing of the budget division. The first controller merely initiated the organization. The second exemplified the "snowball theory" of the office—the budget division provided ammunition with which to pelt the political opposition and the controller was involved in executive policy and strategy. The third controller operated under the administrative or "immaculate" conception, removed from partisan conflict and concerned primarily with efficiency of operations. The incumbent stands somewhere between the extremes of the second and third.

An unfriendly Legislature has cut back the size of the budget staff, and the Governor's in-

dependence in budget planning has also been affected by the State Administrative Board, which is composed of the six elective state administrative officials, the lieutenant governor, and the Governor acting as chairman. The controller is the secretary of the board under the statute. Mr. Schubert felt that Michigan's budget fell short of being a complete plan for embodying the Governor's program, in part because of the large number of elected and other officials and independent agencies beyond the scope of his direct policy control and in part because executive policy exists as a blueprint in only a limited way and frequently develops on an *ad hoc* basis.

Mr. Smith defined the public budget as a plan for action, expressed and executed in financial terms. It embodies what the executive is actually proposing to do, in contrast to mere speeches about his program. He stressed the importance of the budget process in giving the Governor his best opportunity to compare and weigh state activities in one consistent framework.

In Florida, budgetary authority resides in the State Budget Commission, composed of the Governor and six elected officials who comprise his Cabinet. The Governor is chairman and appoints the budget director, who provides service both to the commission and to the Legislature. Past commissions have submitted the draft budgets to critical study, particularly as to the size of appropriations, but have generally supported the Governor's proposals. The Legislature has authority to vote appropriations in advance of the submission of the budget and may change or even rewrite the budget. In practice, however, the relationship between the executive and the Legislature in budget matters has been flexible and harmonious, as compared with other states. Florida is a one-party state and has been unmarked by political upheavals. Mr. Smith has served three Governors as budget director over a period of twenty-three years.

A new law, implemented in 1950, gives the Governor, as chief budget officer, authority over virtually all state funds and considerable discretion over administering appropriations. Mr. Smith felt that the budget office, which analyzed and developed the budget, was the best agency to see that it was followed and adhered to, and also that a program of management improvement in the budget office was essential in discharging this responsibility. Florida is just starting such a program.

Mr. Williams cited Maine as exemplifying a budget system under nominally strong executive control. As in Michigan, the Governor appoints the state's chief fiscal and administrative officer, whose budgetary and other duties are legally prescribed, but executive authority over many state functions is weakened by the number of elected officials and independent agencies. The Governor may request advice on budgetary formulation from a statutory committee of three legislators, but the Governors have tended not to confide their program plans to this committee in advance of their public announcement.

The Governors have ordinarily not recommended drastic changes, merely the retardation or expansion of existing programs. In spite of attempts over the years to reduce expenditures without reducing services, the major portion of the budget has remained impervious to cuts by the Governor; and, in fact, there has been a continuous increase in the cost of government because of expanded services and cost-of-living factors.

Mr. Williams drew a distinction between the role of the budget officer, who must acquire a businessman's knowledge of the purposes and results of the state's programs, viewed as a whole, and the role of the Governor and the legislators. They are elected because their platforms express an understanding of human needs of the people, which they can continue to evaluate through public contacts and public budget hearings. If the Governor meets resistance from the Legislature, he can carry and has successfully, in Maine, carried his program directly to the voters. The budget officer should advise the Governor and the legislators on the basis of his factual knowledge and not of political considerations, which they are better qualified to assess.

From the audience the question first raised was whether an almost complete implementation of the executive budget concept in such states as New York and California may have inhibited staff development and programing in the state departments. Budget staffs tend to conservatism and emphasis on systems and

controls. They may not be the best agents to attack two basic deficiencies of state administration: not enough money and not enough innovation. It was agreed that this is a possibility where there are high caliber department heads and that even in states where decentralization can proceed only as departmental administration improves, budget staffs need to be flexible and knowledgeable in applying detailed controls.

Marked differences in opinion developed over the responsibility of the budget officer for furnishing the Governor with proposals as to revenue sources. One position was that he should not take the initiative, but may offer facts and advice if requested to do so. Other proper sources of such recommendations exist in political advisers or legislative reference services. The other position was that if the budget officer is responsible for judging the adequacy of programs, or is considered the "alter-ego" of the Governor in administrative matters, no one is more qualified or more responsible than he for analyzing and recommending alternative resources for implementing the budget program.

Comment from the floor indicated that orderly budget planning for capital outlays has lagged behind that for current operations and that improvement in this respect is contingent on amassing necessary background information and on strong political support. With respect to the utilization of surpluses for present or new undertakings, it was thought essential for budget officers to sound a warning that subsequent budgets might be thereby increased.

The advantage of combining budgetary with other administrative functions in a single department was debated. Budgeting may absorb a disproportionate amount of the attention of the department head and the legislature may direct its fire at what are essentially nonpolitical aspects of administration. On the other hand, such functions are generally considered necessary tools of executive management, and their concentration in a single department may enhance their use by the Governor.

In his summary remarks, Mr. Steadman reminded the group that the word "political" can be applied to the shaping of public policy, without invidious implications of a spoils system. Irrespective of the partisan debate which may attend the enactment of a budget, its execution and that of other associated public administration functions can and must proceed in accordance with strict legal requirements and sound managerial principles.

Automation and the Public Service

Chairman—John J. Corson, Partner, McKinsey and Company

Panel—Samuel N. Alexander, Chief, Data Processing Systems Division, National Bureau of Standards; Robert M. Ball, Deputy Director, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance; W. Howard Gammon, Project Coordinator, Accounting Policy Division, Office of the Assistant Secretary (Comptroller), U. S. Department of Defense; Bertrand M. Harding, Assistant Director, Collection Division, Internal Revenue Service, U. S. Department of the Treasury

Reporter—Russell A. Kirsch, Electronic Scientist, Data Processing Systems Division, National Bureau of Standards

The panel was concerned with an analysis of the applications of one particular type of automation—automatic data processing—to operations in the federal government. Automatic data processing is distinguished from other types of automation in that the raw material that is processed is information or data rather than material goods, and the final product produced is also information or, preferably, answers rather than processed goods.

Mr. Alexander began with a discussion of the implications for management in the use of automatic data processing equipment. The most immediate consequence of the use of such equipment is to reduce the amount of work at the drudgery level. Those data processing operations in government which involve the maximum amount of repetitious and boring effort with the minimum need of intelligent judgment are the first to which automatic data processing equipment can be applied. In order to achieve even this elementary aspect of automatization a great deal of planning is required.

The nature of this planning places a great responsibility upon management. To plan to

use automatic data processing equipment in even the most obvious and conceptually simple applications requires the preparation of "handbooks of operating procedures" of a detailed nature never previously encountered by management. The procedures so developed will be carried out with flawless fidelity by the machines, and therein lies the rub. There is no check on inaccurate instructions by management since there is no subordinate to "cover up" for even minor errors.

Because of this consideration all organizations that have successfully undertaken to automatize data processing have found it necessary to select management people from within the organization, preferably with considerable experience, and train them in automatic data processing techniques rather than to teach outside data processing specialists the nature of the business being automatized.

Since the planning that must precede an application of automatic data processing equipment to a large government organization requires the best talents of people who have both breadth and depth of understanding of the organization, and since these people are required to design the new automatic data processing procedures to be followed by the machinery, it does not follow that the new procedures will be simple translations of previous manual data processing procedures to automatic methods. Rather, the reengineering of operations often produces new efficiency in the organization even before the installation of automatic equipment. The new equipment simply allows a wider range of new techniques to be explored in order to accomplish end objectives, which need not change under automatization.

Mr. Gammon described several applications of automatic data processing in government. Each of the three Armed Services is using or is about to use several of the large automatic electronic computers in the over $1 million price range for doing data processing in the area of supply management. A significant application of large electronic data processing machinery outside the military is in the Treasury Department, where the reconciliation and payment of checks will be automatized later this year with continuing annual savings of more than $1.75 million and release of 450 clerks for other duties. Other agencies that have smaller problems are sharing the equipment of others who can better afford it.

Mr. Gammon recommended careful reading by all management personnel of *Automation and Technological Change* (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, U. S. Congress, 84th Congress, First Session, Pursuant to Section 5(a) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress, October 14-28, 1955, 644 pp., which is for sale by the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at $2.00) and the Committee Report with the identical title (S. Report 1308).

He also recommended that the audience see the current Broadway play, *The Desk Set,* starring Shirley Booth, which tells the story of the effect on the employees in an organization of the installation of an electronic digital computer, or "giant brain."

An important advantage in the present areas of application in government has been to integrate the information needs of the whole organization. Thus while the centralization of such functions as procurement of materials and the maintenance of facilities is fairly common, for the first time it is practical to have centralized processing of the information needed in making management decisions. (Although the subject was not discussed it seems to this reviewer that the corollary problem of centralized control over the gathering of raw data to feed automatic data processing equipment should receive as much management consideration as the problem of generating and distributing the processed results.)

Mr. Ball described the experience of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance in using punched card equipment for data processing and the recent beginning of a transition of that work to high-speed electronic machines. The personnel problems arising from this transition consist of the displacement of about 300-400 jobs. This will be partially offset by the requirements of new and generally higher-grade jobs in such areas as methods analysis, programing, and the operation of new equipment. Some of the individuals displaced may be able to qualify for the higher-grade jobs. Those who cannot will be absorbed in the organization over the pe-

riod of the change so that no reduction in force will result.

One significant aspect of the transition to electronic processing in BOASI is that the procedures being replaced are already mechanized, since BOASI started in business at a time when punched card techniques were available. Although this makes the changeover much simpler, it seems to this reviewer that the benefits that accrue from a reengineering of operations are not necessarily less because the transition is from punched card methods rather than manual methods to the newer electronic techniques.

The Internal Revenue Service had a problem of preparing a statistical analysis of income from data appearing on income tax returns. As Mr. Harding described it, this job was not of sufficient magnitude to justify the procurement of a large automatic data processing machine, so it was decided to get part-time use of such equipment for the task. The changeover from doing the computation on punched card equipment to the use of a large electronic machine was difficult to accomplish in the period of one year that was available. Unfortunately, there was not enough money available to permit the more desirable parallel operation of both electronic and punched card machines during the course of the change.

Another problem at Internal Revenue is the processing of tax returns. Punched card methods have been tried for computing the tax of individual wage earners. The difficulty experienced here came from the highly decentralized and political nature of the offices of the collectors of internal revenue. Some day, Mr. Harding speculated, it will be possible to check for the payment of tax by every taxpayer every year. Such a job can be done on electronic data processing machines, but not with punched card equipment.

Although this panel considered diverse areas of application for automatic data processing equipment, it was the consensus that in all cases a great deal of planning time is required, generally more than is readily available. One of the personnel problems seems to have been solved satisfactorily by the absorbing of displaced personnel within the organization. The other problem of obtaining the necessary trained people is more difficult to solve. In all cases described, a monetary saving, often considerable, has been realized or can be anticipated, although this matter was not at all certain when some of these pioneering applications were initiated.

New Institutes of Public Administration Overseas

Chairman—Henry Reining, Jr., Dean, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California

Panel—Frederick Bent, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Coe College; Lynton K. Caldwell, Visiting Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley; Ferrel Heady, Assistant Director, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan; Fred W. Riggs, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Yale University; MacDonald Salter, Public Administration Adviser for Europe and Far East, International Cooperation Administration; Walter R. Sharp, Professor of Political Science, Yale University; Frederick J. Tickner, Public Administration Division, Technical Assistance Administration, United Nations

Reporter—Frank B. Cliffe, Jr., Staff Assistant, Public Administration Clearing House

Mr. Reining opened the session by introducing the thirty or forty officials and professors from overseas who were in the audience. He then defined Institutes of Public Administration (IPA's) as organizations with the immediate objective of improving administration—which is in turn a means to the end of economic development. A common premise has been that *democratization* could and should be encouraged by IPA's.

Mr. Bent described three basic problems encountered in teaching public administration at the American University of Beirut. (1) The absence of teaching materials was a serious handicap; American texts are of limited value. Improvisation of materials based on Middle Eastern experiences was necessary—a necessity which, without doubt, increased the value of instruction. (2) The language problem became pressing when graduate-level in-service training was undertaken. At this stage Arabic had to be used—and it had to be Arabic acceptable

to students from a number of countries. (3) United States experts too often do not recognize that they are working with comparatively simple administrative organizations; consequently their advice may be relevant only to the complex U.S. administrative environment. Adaptability is essential and local government experience is perhaps of greatest value.

The chief criterion of an IPA's success is its becoming an integral part of the host country, Mr. Heady said. He outlined four factors of basic importance in determining acceptance, derived from the University of Michigan's experiences in the Philippines. (1) Securing an adequate base of operations is essential. This includes both a physical base and an organizational base. Association with a national university is desirable if a reputable institution exists. (2) The new IPA should expeditiously prove its value to the country's officials by offering such services as training, research, and consultative work, and such tangible objects as organization charts and manuals should be provided as soon as possible. (3) Selection and training of a permanent staff is crucial. The University of Michigan team chose a number of relatively young Filipinos and sent them to the United States for training, using various universities to secure balance and diversity. (4) Transition to national control can be handled—as it was in the Philippines—by first hiring an American as director and later a Filipino or by the UN device of foreign and national codirectors. Scheduling the transition should be a joint responsibility of the foreign staff and of the nationals who will remain with the IPA.

The former codirector for the UN Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East, Mr. Caldwell, delineated four important aspects of IPA administration. (1) Institutional support planning should have first priority in establishing an institute because inadequacy in working relationships, finance, personnel, and material facilities can frustrate well conceived program efforts. (2) Program planning should be kept flexible in the early stages of an institute because the real needs of the program can seldom be foreseen. (3) Teamwork among staff is more important than personal eminence in the selection of overseas personnel. (4) The institute program should be closely related to other forms of technical assistance in administration and to developments in the administration of the host government. It may prove harmful to train public employees substantially beyond the willingness or capacity of their government to utilize their new skills.

Speaking from his experience as technical director of the United Nations Institute of Public Administration in Cairo, Mr. Sharp commented on organizational arrangements, the role of research, and motivation of trainees. (1) The long period of initial negotiations for organizational support—during which time there were no quarters, budgets, or books—provided an opportunity for Egyptians to acquire more realistic anticipations concerning the IPA and for the UN staff to gain useful insights into Egyptian government and administration. (2) Major research programs should not be begun early and research should be started at a simple level, utilizing trainee teams on uncomplicated projects. (3) The motivations of trainees can and should be changed from a desire for such rewards as promotion and study abroad to the longer lasting and more broadly beneficial goals of professionalization and pride in governmental service.

Two common problems in the administration of public administration technical cooperation programs were discussed by Mr. Riggs. (1) In Western cultures there is a battery of formal and informal controls which generally guarantee that administration will be carried on in a responsible and democratic manner. In many non-Western cultures similar controls have not been effectively established and therefore the administrator has far more power than his Western counterpart. Mr. Riggs held that attention should be paid to means for establishing democratic controls over administrators and as a corollary argued that more research is needed on the prerequisites and consequences of the transfer of U.S. and Western European administrative institutions. (2) Mr. Riggs pointed also to the growingly inadequate supply of U.S. administrators and technicians available for technical cooperation missions, and the need for means to make continuing use of the experience of those who have already had overseas experience.

Speaking as a Washington administrator, Mr. Salter noted that his comments would be general. (1) He had observed and noted the growing need and desire for improved management among the countries with which he had dealt. (2) In some instances this took the form of requests for short-term impact type of assistance; in others, projects of a more fundamental nature requiring institutional development were desired. (3) IPA's fall in this latter group. In European countries there has been a growing interest in the development of institutes of business administration as a means of developing institutional support for management improvement. (4) He underscored a significant evaluation in attitudes regarding administrative improvement; there is a growing acceptance of administrative reform and it is no longer considered a sign of weakness. (5) IPA's constitute an important and sometimes focal point within a country for the support of administrative improvement. (6) The establishment of IPA's must be in response to a country request and reflect an understanding of the need by the country for continued institutional support.

Mr. Tickner made three observations based on the remarks of the previous panel speakers. (1) He emphasized the importance of locating the key managerial agency in the host government and building a firm bridge to it. Much of the previous discussion had assumed that a university would serve as the national cooperating agency; Mr. Tickner suggested reliance on a governmental agency as a supplementary or alternative device. (2) A proper definition of the functions of an IPA must involve exclusions as well as inclusions. The IPA should be a stimulator and not a participant in some types of training; in Egypt, clerical training was carried on outside the IPA, though associated with it. While recognizing that in many cultures training has no prestige unless undertaken in a university, he held that some types of training should not be handled in this manner. (3) Mr. Tickner expressed concern that in some cases insufficient attention had been given to the IPA's end product, the student. Training materials are means, not ends. Improvement of administration is the end; the basic procedure is the analysis of weakness.

During the discussion period the central questions were: What are the functions IPA's can and should undertake? Which functions are inappropriate?

1. Transferability and the meaning of "underdeveloped." Various speakers asked for more attention to the question of the transferability of Western institutions to differing cultures and to the related question of the meaning of "underdeveloped." A visitor from Thailand noted Thailand's desire to progress and cooperate with the Western world and its recognition that many Western ideas and institutions are of potential value to it. But the Thais feel that most aspects of their culture—philosophy, religion, literature, for example—cannot be designated as underdeveloped and that consequently many Western institutions are not transferable. This truth is one many Americans seem to have difficulty recognizing.

2. Selection of experts. A guest from Ethiopia, expanding on the point that more attention needs to be given to briefing and orientation, suggested that some people on missions should never have been selected. It was agreed that no amount of training will serve as a substitute for sufficient sensitivity and adaptability.

3. Effecting administrative change. Since it is difficult to secure experts who can work effectively in strange environments, it was suggested that an alternative (or complementary) technique is to change the environment by, for instance, giving counsel and advice. Yet, gratuitous unrequested advice has little effect in changing the environment; Mr. Sharp noted the greater value of training middle-level nationals and returning them to their administrative tasks, anticipating eventual changes. It was agreed that bringing together high officials for discussions of common problems—not "training" them—is an effective way to elicit requests for advice. A major advantage of the consulting process accrues to the American experts rather than those advised. In the process of consulting, the expert learns much about the country and is thereupon placed in a better position to help prepare some of the badly needed literature.

The potential conflict between the implicit or explicit goal of democratization and the

fact of IPA operations in countries by no means democratic evoked considerable discussion. The point was made that democratization is a broad term which can cover many forms. There are apparently authoritarian ways of administering in democracies and in the same way some administrative programs can be carried on democratically in authoritarian countries, even where insistence upon democratization would be poor strategy. It was also suggested that democratization is at the heart of improving administration and that wider participation in decision-making improves administration. In an extension of this line of reasoning, community development programs responding to the "felt needs" were extolled as more democratic—and effective—than training a few individuals in the national capitol to enforce what they consider "good for the people." Further, note was made of the worldwide demand for increased levels of social and economic well-being; these demands are coming primarily from "the people." By satisfying these demands, progress might be made away from paternalism toward democracy.

Agreeing, for example, that it is inappropriate for mail clerks to be trained in a university, the discussants made several points concerning the level and type of IPA training programs. IPA's must win the support of the host government and should act as initiators and stimulators—subsequently returning training functions to appropriate governmental or university groups. In particular, IPA's can train trainers but should steadfastly refuse to undertake training programs on too wide a basis, or to attempt to place all training within a university. IPA's are free to establish Ph.D. programs but they will have to do this with their own funds, not ICA's—with its one-year fiscal cycle. Mr. Tickner maintained that it is incorrect even to envisage study for the Ph.D. as an essential function of IPA training, the main object of which should be to permit the re-thinking of experience, not to prolong formal academic work.

4. Concern with substantive fields of administration and provincial and local administration. The panel was mildly criticized for not considering such substantive fields as business, health, and welfare administration and also provincial and local administration. In its defense it was pointed out that in a two-hour discussion it is impossible to deal with all aspects of the activities of overseas institutes. It was further noted that IPA staff members have participated in the administration of various line programs, aided by the UN and ICA. The question of effecting administrative changes by work in a nation's capitol was dealt with in several ways. It was noted that community development programs have been assisted under the technical cooperation auspices and, more immediately, that "training trainers" is designed to bring about administrative improvement throughout a nation. Negatively, with a shortage of experts it is necessary to start somewhere; positively, training local government officials and considering problems of provincial and local government are becoming increasingly important in the work of both UN and ICA institutes of public administration.

State and Federal Administration: Contrasts and Similarities

Chairman—John A. Perkins, President, University of Delaware

Panel—Sanford Bates, Formerly Commissioner, Department of Institutions and Agencies, New Jersey; Victor Christgau, Director, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance; William G. Colman, Special Assistant to the Director, National Science Foundation; Marshall E. Dimock, Head, Department of Government, Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York University; Carl W. Tiller, Chief, Budget Methods, U.S. Bureau of the Budget

Reporter—York Willbern, Director, Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama

It was apparent in the discussion of this topic that two basic facts influenced all of the other observations made by members of the panel. First, while there are significant similarities and differences between the state administrative systems on the one hand and the federal system on the other, the diversity which exists among the forty-eight states makes generalization extremely difficult; the states differ among themselves, with regard to many

characteristics, more than some of them differ from the United States. Second, a great many of the differences between state administration and federal administration turn around the single characteristic of size.

To begin the discussion, Mr. Perkins asked each participant to suggest specific ways in which state administration was similar to or different from federal administration. Some of the items mentioned are as follows:

1. Federal administrators are farther away from the impact of programs than are state administrators. The "feed-back" is much slower.

2. In state administration, informal social relationships are much stronger and more pervasive. Executive and administrative agencies are closer to the legislature in the sense of close personal acquaintance, and administrators are better acquainted with each other, because of the difference in size.

3. Federal administrative programs are subject to more rapid change than are state. More of the federal functions—defense, economic stabilization, and foreign relations were suggested as examples—are dynamic in character and subject to rapid expansion or contraction. Rapidly changing programs produce special administrative problems.

4. There is generally a much higher degree of independence of gubernatorial control among state administrative agencies than among federal agencies with regard to presidential control. Two important factors producing this independence are widespread occurrence of elective officials in state government and the much more frequent use of earmarked or dedicated funds.

5. In selection of personnel at the federal level, there is a wider area of choice and more prestige.

6. Staff controls are much more institutionalized at the federal level, with more rigid rules and procedures. Also, the influence of the Comptroller-General over federal expenditures is much more pervasive than are comparable controls at the state level.

7. Generally, administrative programs are better financed at the federal level than at the state level.

8. Certain basic similarities between federal and state administration, tending to differentiate these administrations from private administrations, were suggested. One was the comparative underpayment of higher level employees, as compared to private employment. Another was the existence of widespread institutionalized extradepartmental controls, which make it possible for public administrators to make decisions only after considering a much wider and more complicated context of forces and clearances than is true in private administration.

9. Mr. Colman felt that the differences between state administration and federal administration were greater than the similarities, and most of the comparisons tended to be unfavorable to the states. He did feel, however, that the continuing shift of functions from state to federal level had been caused more by political and fiscal reasons than by differences in administrative performance.

Mr. Perkins guided the major portion of the discussion into two general areas: (1) comparisons with regard to the various extradepartmental controls upon administration and (2) comparisons with regard to executive organization and leadership.

The panel discussed influences exerted upon administration by staff agencies, the legislature, the public, and other governments.

Mr. Tiller and Mr. Bates felt that the controls exerted by staff agencies, such as budget, accounting, and personnel, were very similar at federal and state levels. Mr. Tiller pointed out that the existence of earmarked funds made fiscal controls less effective at the state level. All agreed that staff agencies and procedures were inclined to be somewhat less institutionalized and, in some instances, more expeditious at the state level than at the federal level.

With regard to legislative controls, Mr. Christgau and Mr. Perkins suggested that state legislation was likely to be more minutely detailed than federal legislation, but that congressional committees, aided by committee staffs, investigated and exercised closer surveillance over administrative agencies than state legislatures customarily do. With regard to control by the public, Mr. Christgau suggested that state administrators were in much closer contact with the people than were federal administrators. In federal agencies, public

representations come much more frequently through members of Congress. At the state level, the maintenance of professional public relations staff is much less acceptable than at the federal level. Mr. Tiller suggested that the public had available more information on federal *programs* than on state programs, but that it was less well acquainted with federal *administration* than with state administration.

The members of the panel agreed that there was frequently strong federal influence on state programs, through grants-in-aid and through professional cohesion. Mr. Dimock pointed out that there were instances of strong resistance by some states, however, to federal influences.

The panel then considered the matter of executive leadership and organization. Mr. Dimock said that leadership was much more personal in the states, particularly in small states, while at the federal level it was much more institutionalized in character. It was agreed that there was much stronger central executive control over administrative departments at the federal level than at the state, with fewer independent departments, fewer boards, and a higher degree of presidential than of gubernatorial control. Mr. Tiller remarked, however, that the formal pattern of organization is not necessarily determinative of the amount of executive leadership. In the federal government, many departments and bureaus make independent policy decisions, although the tacit consent of the central executive may be considered to be present.

With regard to coordination, there was some discussion of Cabinet operations. Mr. Bates suggested that the members of the President's Cabinet are much more nearly policy advisers to the chief executive than they are operating administrators, while at the state level, the department heads are more nearly in the role of operating heads of specific programs. This makes the cabinet device much less effective at the state level.

Mr. Christgau suggested that there was more need for coordination at the federal level than at the state level, inasmuch as programs are more closely interrelated and impinge upon each other more at the federal level, and are more likely to be changing and dynamic. Mr. Dimock felt that there were too many variables with regard to problems and methods of coordination in the forty-eight states to permit any reliable generalizations.

Differences in personnel systems were considered briefly toward the end of the session. Mr. Colman observed that personnel systems are of course smaller in the states, and where merit systems are well established at the state level they can be operated with more dispatch and convenience than in the more cumbersome federal environment. At the state level, however, the pluralization of executive agencies constitutes a great obstacle. He felt that because of various factors working in opposite directions, it was difficult to indicate any superiority of personnel operations at one level as compared to another.

Urban Transportation: Organization and Administration

Chairman—Matthias E. Lukens, Assistant Executive Director, Port of New York Authority

Panel—John D. Corcoran, Field Supervisor, Public Administration Service; Kenneth Hoover, Project Director, Mass Transportation Surveys, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D. C.; D. Grant Mickle, Director, Traffic Engineering Division, Automotive Safety Foundation; Wilfred Owen, Senior Staff Member, The Brookings Institution; W. A. Rusch, Staff Director, National Committee on Urban Transportation

Reporter—Carlton C. Robinson, Traffic Engineer, Automotive Safety Foundation

"A city without a transportation problem is a dying city." Mr. Lukens substantiated this opening statement by pointing out that practically every large American city has recently completed or is now conducting a major transportation study. This is essential if these cities are to meet the requirement for expanded transportation facilities demanded by a growing economy.

The great need for an expanded program of fact gathering in the urban transportation field was stressed by Mr. Rusch as he detailed the objectives of the National Committee on Urban Transportation. The committee, which

is sponsored by seven organizations of municipal officials, has prepared manuals to aid cities in obtaining basic transportation data. This program envisions the systematic, continuing collection of information on financial, legal, and administrative processes; the demand for movement of people and goods; the extent and condition of street facilities and the level of street service; and the extent and condition of transit facilities and service. This basic information may be compared with standards to become the foundation for a sound solution to urban transportation problems.

Mr. Hoover, in describing the transportation studies now under way in the District of Columbia, stressed that annexation, the "old" solution to the problems of urban growth, is no longer adequate. The expansion is so great that whole counties or parts of several states may be involved in a single metropolitan area. Solution to these problems requires cooperative action among jurisdictions and often necessitates an interstate compact, as has been recommended for the Washington metropolitan area. Cooperation is also required among specialists to obtain a comprehensive picture of the present and future transportation needs of a community: planners for land-use data, economists for predictions of growth, traffic engineers for trip desires, and designers for the design and cost estimates of proposed improvements.

Mr. Mickle pointed out that effective intergovernmental cooperation was almost impossible in many areas, owing to the absence of an agency of city government with centralized authority to deal with transportation problems. The diffusion of transportation functions among departments results in divided authority, conflicts, and other inefficiencies. Desirable physical improvements, even those of a minor type, may be shuttled back and forth from one department to another and hamper cities in overcoming the huge backlog of transportation deficiencies.

In support of the contention that an important function such as transportation should be centralized in a single department, Mr. Mickle quoted the New York City Mayor's Committee on Management survey: ". . . that there be a separate and comprehensive agency for each municipal function, and that the number and size of the agencies be determined by the number of functions and not by any arbitrary idea as to the span of control."

Returning to the theme of cooperation, Mr. Owen stated that "no transportation magic will solve the transportation problem alone," and that transportation planning must be integrated with the entire urban development. In stressing the need for cooperation between traffic and land-use agencies, Mr. Owen stated that land use, not transportation, is at the bottom of the transportation problem, and that in cases cited, improper land use created the transportation problem. "The problem will not be solved until traffic people bring in land people. 'Transportation cannot operate in a vacuum.' "

Mr. Corcoran, in addition to summing up the session, detailed the proposal for a metropolitan government being considered in Dade County, Florida. Under this proposal, the metropolitan agencies would have responsibility for the master traffic plan, major arterials, and all air, water, rail, and public transportation. The local governments would retain control over the construction, operation, and maintenance of purely local streets and parking facilities of a local character.

The Prestige of the Public Service in 1956

Chairman—Emery E. Olson, Executive Vice President, Sterling Electric Motors, Inc.

Opening Speaker—Philip Young, Chairman, U. S. Civil Service Commission

Panel—Stephen K. Bailey, Director, Graduate Program, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; Morris Janowitz, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Michigan; Perrin Stryker, Board of Editors, *Fortune*

Reporter—Lowell H. Hattery, Professor of Government and Public Administration, The American University

The prestige of the public service is a complex matter and subject to exploration from various points of view. In the instance of this panel discussion, the chairman directed primary attention to the impact of prestige on

recruitment, performance, and retention of management personnel at the upper levels. Each participant analyzed the situation from the vantage point of his own background.

Philip Young, chairman, U. S. Civil Service Commission, noted that a federal personnel program for a 2,000,000-man peacetime work force is very young. We need a new look and program changes which are related to the magnitude of today's problems. Recent accomplishments will bring higher prestige to public personnel administration. He cited the following as examples: (1) career-conditional appointment; (2) incentive awards program; (3) extension of civil service overseas; (4) the new Federal Service Entrance Examination; (5) fringe benefits; (6) improved management practice. These accomplishments have already influenced well-informed people, and are "beginning to flow over into the national mass media and counteract traditional unfavorable attitudes toward the government service." To maintain this advantage, Mr. Young called for "the leaders of both parties to 'stick to the facts' when discussing the federal career service and the federal employees who are a part of it." Mr. Young added: "Uninformed charges sometimes made against federal employees as a class during the heat of political campaigns can do great disservice to the nation by impairing prestige and morale of the federal work force."

Mr. Janowitz reported on a public opinion survey of 764 persons in the Detroit metropolitan area, and compared attitudes of 1955 Detroiters with L. D. White's study of 1927 Chicagoans. He reported a trend toward higher public prestige of employment in the public service. Mr. Janowitz reported further that "individuals in the lower class, and with limited education expressed the highest esteem for the public service." He also found that persons who work for the government in Detroit "think less of their jobs than does the public at large." Further details of the study are reported in an article by Mr. Janowitz and Deil Wright in the Winter, 1956, issue of the *Public Administration Review.*

Mr. Bailey summarized the proceedings of a conference held at Princeton University, March 2-4, 1956, devoted to the "Political Executive in the National Government." The conference found that "extraordinary measures must be taken" to help insure an adequate supply of qualified political executives. Concerning public attitudes toward federal employment, the conference recommended specifically that: (1) leaders of both political parties recognize publicly the vital role of public service, and counsel against generalized attacks upon governmental officials and employees; (2) educational institutions and mass media promote a wider and more accurate understanding of the importance and satisfactions of government and political service; (3) business firms, labor unions, universities, local and state governments, and other institutions be encouraged to lend personnel and regard it as a mark of achievement.

Mr. Stryker noted essential differences between management jobs in industry and government. They are "rooted differently," he said. However, Mr. Stryker observed that the recruitment problem for executive talent in industry is just as serious as in government. On the other hand, he recognized that industry in general tends to have a poor opinion of government efficiency. This is due, Mr. Stryker believes, to the lack of a "hard money" yardstick in government. Mr. Stryker also observed that although money and status lend prestige to upper middle management in business, the best executives appear to be those who are motivated primarily not by ego and personal ambition but by a sincere desire to do the best job they can for their organizations.

Mr. Olson summarized the discussion and in conclusion noted that although values other than salary are important, "it is easier to become a selfless, dedicated leader if minimum material rewards are available."

Research Notes

Compiled by John C. Honey,
Director, Government Studies Program,
National Science Foundation

Economic and Geographical Bases of the Four Northern Counties of New York State

The Maxwell Research Center of Syracuse University, under a contract with the New York State Department of Commerce, is conducting a study of the economic and geographical bases of the four northern counties of New York State—Clinton, Franklin, St. Lawrence, and Jefferson counties. All four counties anticipate sizable growth in the next decade as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project. One of them, St. Lawrence, is directly adjacent to a major portion of the project. It is hoped that the study will indicate the lines of future population growth, assist in over-all planning for the region, and act as a guide in the location of new industrial sites.

The study consists of the following four separate projects:

1. The mapping of land utilization in three of the counties, under the direction of Robert Dickinson, professor of geography. Aiding him are Franklin Stern and Henry Hymes, graduate assistants in geography. This study will examine land use and potential development.

2. The mapping of the location of industrial operations in three of the counties, under the direction of John Thompson, associate professor of geography. He is assisted by James Jennings, a graduate assistant in geography.

3. A study of the economic implications of deepening and widening the Richelieu Canal which connects Lake Champlain and the St. Lawrence River, by A. M. McIsaac, professor of economics, and graduate assistant Carl Vann.

4. A study of the economic relationships between the northern counties and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, by Jesse V. Burkhead, professor of economics, assisted by William Eagan.

The entire study will be reviewed by an interdepartmental committee of Syracuse University and the Syracuse Medical School faculty. The latter are represented because of their interest in the social psychological aspects of the project. Further information may be obtained from Sidney C. Sufrin, Director, Maxwell Research Center.

Pressure Group Attitudes toward the UN System

The interests of various United States pressure groups in the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies are being investigated by nine candidates for the Master of Public Affairs degree at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, under the supervision of Professor Gerard J. Mangone.

The three major focuses of the study are the manner in which the various pressure groups are organized; the ways in which they convey their points of view to the UN, the U.S. gov-

NOTE: Readers of *Public Administration Review* are invited to report items of research in progress through Research Notes. A report on any one project should not exceed 300 words and should include information on such matters as the conceptual framework of the study, its aims, tentative conclusions, anticipated uses, sources of information, principal investigators, and expected date of completion. A fuller announcement on the scope of Research Notes appeared in the Summer, 1955, issue of the *Review*.

Research Notes are compiled by three members of the staff of the National Science Foundation: Mrs. Kathryn S. Arnow, John C. Honey, and Herbert H. Rosenberg. Reports should be addressed to John C. Honey, Director of Governmental Studies, National Science Foundation, Washington 25, D. C.

ernment, and general public; and the effect such pressures have upon the attitudes and actions of policy-makers. A variety of business, agricultural, professional, ethnic, and patriotic organizations have been selected for consideration. The nature of their leadership, the content of their policy resolutions at the national or state level, and the manner in which information is disseminated to their rank and file membership are among the aspects being studied. Research materials have been obtained by visits to the national and local headquarters of the organized interests, interviews with their leaders, study of their records, attendance at their conventions, and a sampling through polls of their membership's opinion on the UN.

Consultations have been had with the staffs of the Public Service Division of the U.S. State Department, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the nongovernmental organizations section of the UN Economic and Social Council and with former members of the U.S. delegation to the UN.

Work on this project is scheduled for completion in 1956.

Administration of Grazing on the Public Domain

The passage of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 marked the end of an era of free competition for the vacant grazing lands of the West. The old unrestricted competition for range and water resulted in unstable livestock operations, a sadly depleted pasture land, and accelerated erosion.

A case study now in process by Phillip O. Foss, Political Science Department, University of Oregon, examines the formation and development of the agency designated to administer the allocation and maintenance of 142 million acres of federal range. The study inquires into problems of government-private industry enterprise, executive bureau-legislative committee relations, the competition for and conservation of scarce natural resources, interest group conflicts within a bureaucracy, and the implications of a strong, permanent advisory board system. It is expected that the study will be completed in the summer of 1956.

Fulbright Program with Underdeveloped Countries

The bearing of social, economic, and educational conditions in the underdeveloped countries upon the success of programs of educational exchange between those countries and the United States has been under study for the past three years by the Committee on International Exchange of Persons of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. The Committee on International Exchange of Persons, during the past seven years, has been in charge of reviewing the applications of both American and foreign scholars for awards under the Fulbright Exchange Program and nominating candidates to the Board of Foreign Scholarships and the Department of State. The study in question was undertaken to meet the need which the committee came to feel for specific information and expert counsel, particularly in nominating candidates for awards and in advising on the long-range planning of programs with less economically and educationally developed countries where the fundamental ways of life do not have their origin in Western civilization. It was hoped that the study would cast light on various special factors which should be taken into consideration in the administration of such exchange programs.

The study has two phases. The first, completed in December, 1955, took the form of a review, by the Advisory Committees, of the Fulbright exchange programs for the Near East and South Asia—in broad economic, social, educational, and administrative terms with particular focus on Iraq and India.

Some of the generalizations which the two Advisory Committees reached at the conclusion of the first phase included the following:

> Exchange programs with Western Europe do not provide suitable patterns for exchanges between the United States and countries of the Near East and South Asia.
>
> The social sciences and the humanities should have a major position in the Fulbright programs with the underdeveloped countries.
>
> Research into the cultures of the Near East and South Asia is necessary in order that universities in these countries can escape from their dependence, particularly in the social sciences, upon the learning of the West.

Studies of Western thought and civilization are most valuable in exchange programs when presented from a comparative point of view and when used to interpret the nature of the social change in underdeveloped countries which results from technological advances.

The Fulbright Foundations in countries of the Near East and South Asia are in an excellent position to make a systematic study of the adjustment of the grantees and of their utilization by local educational institutions. Educational officers are needed to assist the foundations in program planning and in exploring opportunities for more effective exchange activities.

The Advisory Committee has received from The Ford Foundation, which also gave support to the earlier phase, a second grant to continue the study for another year with the aim of identifying the most significant conditions governing the performance of the individual Fulbright scholar in the field. Ultimately the findings of the study will be related to the practical problems of selecting grantees, minimizing difficulties of adjustment abroad, and helping the grantees to increase the effectiveness of their work.

Inter-University Case Program

Case studies of the Inter-University Case Program may be summarized under three categories: (1) completed cases which have been accepted for publication; (2) cases currently being written which will be published if found acceptable after critical scrutiny in the ICP and if occasional agency clearance obstacles can be met; and (3) case studies which ICP would like to see undertaken provided it can locate able writers who have intimate access to suitable situations. At the moment there are approximately fifty cases in these three categories.

Cases to Be Published. These cases include two which deal with state civil service-personnel boards. "The Reorganization of the California State Personnel Board" by Frederick C. Mosher describes in detail how that board was transformed from a specialist to a generalist type of organization. "The Transfer of the Kansas State Civil Service Department" by Peter Bart and Milton Cummings depicts briefly the political and administrative forces in a reorganization which moved an independent civil service-personnel unit into, and to a large extent under, a new state division of administration.

On the fiscal side, complementing J. D. Williams' recently published case, *The Impounding of Funds by the Bureau of the Budget,* will be a publication, "Two General Accounting Office Cases," by Gerald Schulsinger. One of these cases focuses on disallowance of travel vouchers; the other describes the work of the GAO in connection with a criticized open-market grain purchase by an agency operating under quasi-commercial conditions.

The first case in ICP's series on resources administration (financed by a special grant from Resources for the Future, Inc.) is "From Forest to Front Page" by Roscoe C. Martin. Before Bowaters Co. could build and operate a large new pulp mill in East Tennessee, it had to win approval from, and make arrangements with, a large number of governmental agencies at every level. These are described by Mr. Martin, whose case is divided into two parts which may be used separately. Other cases in this resources series which are still in the preparation stage include one on the Echo Park Dam controversy and one describing the preparation of an inter-agency report on upstream-downstream development of the White and Red Rivers.

Also to be published shortly are David Brown's "The Public Advisory Board and the Tariff," which shows the preparers of the Bell Report on trade and tariff policy caught in the Truman-Eisenhower transition, and "The Coterminous Boundaries Dispute" by Edwin Read. The latter, ICP's first case set in a country with a parliamentary system, describes the protest of a small prairie town against boundary reorganization and against administrative privacy imposed upon a boundary commission by the Alberta provincial government.

In Preparation. The majority of cases now in preparation are state and local. Some may be included in ICP's second casebook which will have as its theme, "Government at the State and Local Level." A promising series is on executive appointments. One of these cases will describe the mayor of a large city selecting his cabinet and staff. Another series deals with administrative and political aspects of school expansion issues. Themes of other cases in

preparation include: a mayor-fire chief dispute; a police disciplinary problem with political overtones; school desegregation; city hall and a city hospital revolt; the preparation of a state budget; local and county planning; and management-automation problems. Cases at the national level include those which illustrate management and decentralization problems; headquarters-field relationships; labor problems; civil defense; and the resolution of conflicts between administrative and political values. One case is on international administration.

Being Planned. ICP has circulated to its member universities a list of various kinds of cases it would like to publish provided it can locate able writers with access to suitable situations. This list may be obtained by writing to Edwin A. Bock, Staff Director of ICP, 45 East 65th St., New York 21, N. Y. Additional cases are sought in the areas of executive appointments, budgeting, lay commissions at the state and local level, and relationships of career administrators to political superiors during political transitions.

From the point of view of technique, ICP seeks to experiment in enlisting the cooperation of working administrators in the preparation of cases by capture and record methods. To achieve first-hand intimacy, ICP may agree to withhold publication of a case study until such publication will not embarrass an official. In addition to "decision-making" cases, ICP also seeks to produce cases which illustrate the continuing governmental process and which depict political and administrative relationships. Autobiographical accounts (including those of retired lobbyists), narrations of "a day in the life of a —," and cases in which the reader is asked to furnish the conclusion are also sought for experimental purposes.

Grants for Field Studies of Political Groups

A program of grants to individual scholars for field studies of political groups during the academic years 1957-58 and 1958-59 is to be offered by the Social Science Research Council, as a part of a new five-year program of the Council's Committee on Comparative Politics. Financial support for this new program has been provided by a grant to the SSRC from The Ford Foundation.

Applications for grants will be reviewed by the Committee on Comparative Politics, which will give preference to proposals for studies of political groups and processes in foreign areas where field research is feasible and present knowledge is inadequate.

The objective of the grants program is to study such groups, whether they are political parties and interest groups in the Western sense, parts of the formal governmental structure, or traditional entities such as powerful families or tribal groups. It is expected that the roles such groups play in politics, their values and the goals they seek through politics, their relations to different elements in the society and to each other, and the ways in which they control or influence the formal governmental agencies will be studied. More detailed statements of the committee's views and approach may be found in articles prepared by its two subcommittees and published in the December, 1955, issue of *The American Political Science Review.*

The five-year program of the committee, of which the field work phase is to be carried out through the grants program, will be concerned not only with increasing knowledge of foreign political processes, but also with encouraging the selection of common problems for research and the use of common methods in order to assure comparability of the results of field studies. The committee will prepare materials suggesting problems for research and appropriate methods. It will hold conferences for the purpose of discussing its approach and the findings of field studies made under its auspices. At the conclusion of the field work phase of its program the committee will sponsor a series of analytical studies, based in part on the results of the field research.

Applicants for grants must possess the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent and must be prepared to undertake field research within the scope of the committee's concern in specific foreign areas. One of the purposes of the program is to afford opportunities for field study to individuals who are not associated with research institutes. An effort will be made to distribute the awards among the major foreign areas, such as Western Europe, Southeast and South

Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, although not necessarily in equal numbers. While the amounts of individual grants will vary in accordance with the program to be undertaken, in general the maximum grant might include the equivalent of salary for not more than eighteen months and allowances for travel and research expenses.

Application forms may be obtained from the Washington office of the Social Science Research Council, 726 Jackson Place, Washington, D.C. Applications for support of field work during 1957-58 should be received by the Washington Office not later than November 15, 1956.

Recreation for Aging in North Carolina

In recognition of the rapidly increasing proportion of the population which is beyond 65, the University of North Carolina, in cooperation with the North Carolina Recreation Commission and the North Carolina Recreation Society, has sponsored two recent Southern Regional Conferences on Recreation for the Aging. As an outgrowth of these conferences, a two-year study of recreation for the aging in the state has been undertaken with the financial assistance of several life insurance companies domiciled in the state.

The study, in three parts, is concerned with ascertaining the place of organized recreation in the life of senior citizens; the desire of older people for organized recreation; the values of recreation programs to the aging individual; needs of the aging for group participation, family life, religious contacts, and community relationships; organization and administrative procedures for promoting recreation for the aging; programs of recreational activities; and leadership qualifications among the aging themselves. Special study is being given to individuals who are not in clubs.

The first part of the project, exploratory in nature, has developed case studies of differing types of aged individuals. The second part has analyzed facts collected from many sources on population composition and trends by age for the United States and for North Carolina. The United States Census, the statistical division of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, and the works of many demographers are the resources for this section.

The third part of the study makes an analysis and interpretation of gerontology in an attempt better to understand the individual in order to be able more effectively to plan for his recreation. The literature in the field has been reviewed and much information has been obtained through interviews with older individuals, especially with regard to their attitudes. The needs of aging individuals in different sectors of the population have also been explored.

Growing out of the analysis and interpretation of the information collected will be three practical publications to assist communities, agencies, and individuals interested in organizing and administering group programs for the aging and also a full research report.

A number of recommendations specifically related to recreation for the aging have been developed. These include the following:

1. Every community in the state should organize a committee to plan recreation programs for the aging.
2. The sponsorship within the state of the Southern Regional Conferences on Recreation for the Aging should be continued.
3. Services of all national voluntary, federal, state, and local agencies and organizations interested in this field should be utilized.
4. Where clubs for the aging are established, or are already in operation, they should be provided with adequate leadership, sufficient facilities, a varied program of activities, and adequate financial support.

Since this is the first study of its type in the United States, the project has indicated many problems which need further study and has posed many questions which call for further investigation and research. The study is under the direction of Harold D. Meyer, professor of sociology and chairman of the Recreational Leadership Curriculum, University of North Carolina.

Virginia Parole System

At the request of the Parole Board of the state of Virginia, the Bureau of Public Administration, University of Virginia, recently pre-

pared an appraisal of the first twelve years of the Virginia Parole System.

Two principal areas of research, each involving its own type of methodology, are covered in the report. The first concerns an intensive organization and methods study of the present structure and procedures utilized by the parole system. Major problems encountered in this area include the extent to which members of the Parole Board are involved in administrative details—the worrisome problem of central office relations, staff needs, and management difficulties. The second part of the report is an attempt to appraise the parole product in Virginia on the basis of a statistical measurement of the success or failure of persons released from parole. This section is built around data compiled under some forty-eight factors concerning the lives and records of the 4,874 persons who were released on parole between October 1, 1942, and January 1, 1954.

Major recommendations include a reorganization of the central office staff, the creation of a new position of director of parole, and the establishment of regional offices for parole supervisors. The statistical section appears to indicate that such data can be a useful aid in parole selection and supervision. For research purposes, however, these data illustrate the weaknesses of the statistical approach in studying human behavior. It was found, for example, that in classifying individuals there is a tendency to establish so many categories that none contains a sufficient number to be statistically significant. It was further found that in certain categories value judgments had to be used that were not susceptible to accurate cross checks. On the other hand, it was found that an efficient records system will yield data that meet the test of accuracy and completeness and that, with care, such data can be used as an aid but should never replace the considered judgment of experienced parole board members.

Frank K. Gibson is the author of the report, entitled *The Virginia Parole System: An Appraisal of Its First Twelve Years.* It has been published by the Bureau of Public Administration, University of Virginia. Mr. Gibson is now at the University of Georgia where he is assistant professor of political science and director, Bureau of Public Administration.

Standard Classification System, National Committee on City Financial Statistics

The National Committee on City Financial Statistics, recently organized to promote freer interchange of information on municipal finances, is undertaking, as its first major project, the establishment of a standard classification system for uniform reporting of police and fire expenditures in cities with populations of 250,000 or more. If this study proves useful in facilitating more valid intercity per capita comparisons of operating costs than have been possible in the past, an effort will be made to develop uniform reporting for other functions of city government.

The establishment of the national committee grew out of an earlier effort, by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, to compare the cost of government in Philadelphia with that of other major cities. The difficulty of making valid intercity comparisons, because of the lack of complete information on the cost of municipal services, led the chamber to invite representatives of other large cities to a meeting early in 1956 to consider ways of overcoming this difficulty. While the representatives recognized that present and future problems of financing local government required consideration of other factors besides municipal operating costs, it was felt that uniform reporting of the latter would constitute a highly desirable first step.

Membership in the National Committee on City Financial Statistics is open to city officials, representatives of Chambers of Commerce, and research agencies of cities with a population of 250,000 or more. All member cities will be requested to collect fiscal data for functions under review and to cooperate in collecting fiscal data on overlying governments serving their city. A subcommittee, with the help of the United States Census Bureau, will establish standards for classifying functional activities.

Philip Baczkowski, director of the budget, Buffalo, New York, is chairman of the new committee, and William A. Schellenberg, manager, Tax Division, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, is secretary.

Contemporary Topics

Compiled by Opal D. David

Woodrow Wilson Centennial

The celebration during 1956 of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson is producing a wealth of new material in the field of public administration as colleges and universities and other interested groups move ahead with a series of programs honoring the former President by talking about his ideas and their impact on the world today.

Bryn Mawr College, where Wilson began his teaching career in 1885, joined with the Woodrow Wilson Foundation to sponsor a two-day conference January 5-6, at which lectures were given by William Langer, of Harvard University; F. Eric Goldman, of Princeton; and Arthur Link, of Northwestern. The University of Chicago sponsored a five-day program of public lectures and seminars in early February, under the chairmanship of Quincy Wright, which included presentations by Raymond Fosdick, "Personal Recollections of Woodrow Wilson"; Francis B. Sayre, "The World Vision of Woodrow Wilson"; Jonathan W. Daniels, "Wilson, Politican and Statesman"; Arthur W. Macmahon, "Wilson, the Administrator and Politician"; Marshall E. Dimock, "Wilson, the Domestic Reformer"; and Louis Brownlow, "Wilson, the Man." At Princeton University, March 2-5, under the chairmanship of Stephen K. Bailey, a group of sixty invited officials and other leaders from public life gathered to consider the problem of insuring high-level political management of our national government, basing their discussions on papers prepared by Wallace S. Sayre, Harlan Cleveland, and Paul H. Appleby.

Three lectures at Harvard on March 7 included one by Paul Herzog on "Wilson, President." On March 8, Richard S. Childs delivered an address at Yale University on "A Legacy from Wilson" which emphasized his many contributions to public administration. At the University of Virginia a two-day program, April 16-17, under the chairmanship of John Gange, featured lectures by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson on "Executive-Congressional Relationships." At Dartmouth College a program has been scheduled for late spring with Edward S. Corwin as the speaker on "Woodrow Wilson's Contribution to the Presidency."

Much of this material will be published in special memorial editions. In addition, a number of Wilson's works which are out of print or hard to obtain are being brought out in new editions, including a reprint of his *Congressional Government* with an introduction by Walter Lippmann.

Details about the various events scheduled during the rest of the year and other information about the centennial celebration may be secured from the headquarters of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission, Interior Building, Washington 25, D. C., and from the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, 45 East 65th Street, New York 21, N. Y. Inquiries about the availability of copies of lectures or reports of meetings should be addressed to the sponsoring college or university or other organization.

Presidential Inability Question

A Special Subcommittee to Study Presidential Inability of the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on April 11-12 to explore further the problems arising out of the inconclusive language of the Constitution with respect to how and when a President should be declared unable to discharge his duties.

President Eisenhower, at his news conference on January 19, had said he thought the subject "should be carefully studied by the Congress, advised with by the Attorney Gen-

eral, and any kind of advice they want from the executive department, and some kind of a resolution of doubt reached." Again, on February 29—the day he announced his decision to run for a second term—he stated, in reply to a question, that he would favor passage of clarifying legislation as soon as it could be drawn up, though not because of any doubt in his mind about his own health.

In the interval between these two statements, the special subcommittee had released copies of a *Committee Print* containing the statements submitted by the seventeen experts in the fields of political science and constitutional law who had responded to a questionnaire sent out by Congressman Emanuel Celler, chairman of the committee, as well as a memorandum prepared for the committee by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on provisions of state laws relating to disability of the chief executive.

On the basis of the information assembled in this document, six different draft bills were prepared by the committee staff for discussion at the public hearings on April 11-12. Also up for consideration were bills submitted earlier in the session by Congressman Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., of New Jersey and Senator Frederick G. Payne of Maine. Witnesses at these hearings included a number of the people who had responded to the Celler questionnaire, as well as other officials and experts who had evidenced interest in finding a solution for this problem.

On the basis of the statements presented at these hearings and further research by the committee staff, legislative proposals are being prepared for introduction and consideration by the full Congress.

Role of Economic Council Members

This year's hearings on the Economic Report of the President (*Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report,* 84th Congress, 2d session) include an interesting exchange of letters between Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and Senator Paul H. Douglas, chairman of the Joint Committee, on a subject which has been debated frequently since the passage of the Employment Act of 1946 establishing both the council and the joint committee.

The first chairman of the council, Edwin G. Nourse, argued that members of the council, because of their advisory capacity to the President, should not testify before congressional committees.

A completely opposite view was held by Leon H. Keyserling, a member of the council under Nourse's chairmanship and later chairman. Mr. Keyserling believed that members of the council could and should serve as spokesmen for the administration's economic policies, and during his chairmanship he testified at public hearings of the joint committee as well as in executive sessions.

Prior to this year, Chairman Burns has met with the joint committee in executive sessions at which transcripts were made, but with the right to edit his remarks before publication. When he appeared before the committee this year, however, Dr. Burns expressed such strong objection to having a transcript made that it was agreed that, although a reporter would take notes, these would not be typed up pending a final decision by the committee. The exchange of letters included in the record of the hearings (pp. 688-691) presents Mr. Burns's explanation of his position and Senator Douglas' reply for the committee.

The core of Mr. Burns's argument is that the language of the Employment Act, as well as its legislative history, "expresses the plain intent of the Congress that members of the Council should function as professional economists, giving their views on economic problems and policies in an objective, nonpartisan manner." This objectivity is likely to be impaired, he believes, if a member of the Council "becomes a public spokesman for the administration, and that is what testimony in print implies as a practical matter. . . ."

In replying for the joint committee (which agreed to comply with the council chairman's request that the notes of the January 30 executive hearing not be transcribed), Senator Douglas noted that the members "agreed that there is considerable logic to your position that the Council of Economic Advisers should serve the President anonymously. There was a strong bipartisan feeling on the part of the committee, however, that this position is in-

consistent with your practice of making public speeches in which you clearly discuss current economic issues and defend the administration's program."

The Committee Report (S. Report No. 1606, 84th Congress, 2d session), released following completion of the hearings, reiterated this position in the following language, which was agreed to by all but one member of the committee: "We recognize the reluctance of the present Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to discuss fully and freely for the record the implications and assumptions of the Economic Report. The committee is not ready to pass final judgment on the merits of this position. But in the interests of consistency, we feel Council members who take this position should likewise avoid the role of policy spokesmen for the administration through the press, the air waves, and the speaker's platform."

Government Security Commission

The chairman of the Commission on Government Security, established by Congress last year to review all federal programs involving personnel and physical security (See Winter, 1956, *Review*, p. 66), appeared before a House Appropriations subcommittee in February to ask for an appropriation of $200,000 in addition to the $50,000 originally appropriated for the work of the commission. At the same time, he served notice that a further supplemental appropriation for 1957 would be requested as soon as the amount needed could be determined. Asked to estimate how much more might be needed, Chairman Loyd Wright compared the size of the job to that of the recent Hoover Commission and said that "to do the kind of a job we ought to do under your mandate, it will cost us at least $2 million."

The final report of the commission is supposed to be submitted by December 31, 1956, but discussions at the hearing indicated that this date will be extended.

The commission has announced appointments to eight top staff positions, and expects to have between sixty and eighty people working for it by the end of this fiscal year. Members of the commission receive no salary but are reimbursed for travel expenses and draw per diem when on duty.

Executive Reserve Established

Executive Order 10660, issued by President Eisenhower on February 16, 1956, establishes in the executive branch of the government a National Defense Executive Reserve and directs the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization "to institute and administer the Executive Reserve program; to coordinate the activities of other agencies in establishing units of the Reserve; to provide for appropriate standards of recruitment and training; and to issue necessary rules and regulations in connection with such program."

The creation of a civilian reserve of this kind, composed of persons selected and trained for employment in executive positions in the federal government during periods of emergency, was authorized in 1955 in connection with the extension at that time of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Defense Mobilization Order I-21, issued by ODM Director Arthur S. Flemming on February 23, outlines the plan in greater detail. Oversight of the program for ODM rests with the assistant director for manpower, Brigadier General Carlton S. Dargusch. Departments and agencies having major mobilization responsibilities are authorized, after consultation with him, to establish units of the reserve, select and designate members of such units, and institute programs for their training.

The order provides for the establishment of two committees: (1) an Inter-Agency Executive Reserve Committee, whose members are to be appointed by the assistant director for manpower, ODM, from among the persons designated to direct the programs in the participating agencies, with a chairman to be named by the director of ODM; and (2) an Advisory Committee to the director of ODM, whose members are to be drawn from private life.

Members of the reserve are to be selected from all segments of the economy and may include persons serving in government on a full- or part-time basis. Each person designated will be asked to submit a statement of understanding indicating his immediate availability for assignment in the event of a national emergency, his willingness to attend a course of training at least once a year in Washington or some regional point, and the concurrence of

his employer in these arrangements. The degree of security clearance necessary for each reservist is to be determined by the department or agency involved; official designation of members will be withheld until such clearance has been obtained.

The Civil Service Commission will maintain a central register of reserve members to assist the departments and agencies in avoiding the issuance of invitations to persons already in the reserve and guarding against excessive governmental demands on a single employer. The commission will also assist in the preparation of manuals, handbooks, and other materials for use in the training programs established by the participating departments and agencies.

Federal Training Bills Introduced

Bills have been introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives to authorize the heads of federal agencies to pay for training at nonfederal facilities for their civilian employees when they find that such training will contribute to the more effective functioning of their agencies. The two identical bills (S. 3287, introduced by Senators Olin D. Johnston of South Carolina and Frank Carlson of Kansas, and H. R. 9510, introduced by Representative Tom Murray of Tennessee) would replace the existing complex array of training laws for various agencies of the executive branch with one comprehensive law applicable to all but a few excepted agencies such as the Central Intelligence Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Foreign Service of the State Department.

Training authorized under this proposal could be with "State, county, local or foreign governments, interstate or international organizations, or instrumentalities thereof; institutions of learning; laboratories; trade, labor, agricultural, or scientific associations; foundations; industrial or commercial organizations; or other appropriate organizations and facilities, foreign or domestic."

The Civil Service Commission announced more than a year ago that a tentative legislative proposal along these lines had been drafted by the administration and was being circulated to the various departments and agencies for their views and comments. The language of the present proposal was submitted to Congress by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Philip Young, on February 20, 1956, with a request for favorable action.

State Aid for Special Training

Interns and trainees in the New York State government may be reimbursed for part of their tuition fees for attending approved courses in government and public administration, under a plan announced recently by the State Department of Civil Service.

The state will pay one-half the tuition for interns with a master's degree who want to take more courses and three-fourths for interns and trainees with a bachelor's degree. Students will get the money on successful completion at any accredited college or university of courses similar in content to those offered by the state's graduate program in public administration. The assistance will apply to no more than twelve credit hours and must be used within two years of the date of first registration.

Congressional Investigations of Civil Service

The Civil Service Commission has been the object during recent months of intensive investigations by both the Senate and the House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service.

The report of the House committee (H. Rep. No. 1844, 84th Congress, 2d session), released on March 1, deals in unusual detail with matters of organization and internal administration, as evidenced, for example, by inclusion in the report of a specific recommendation that the commission "should establish a firm policy of holding formal meetings at least once each week" and another to the effect that the agency should "make every effort to secure new or different building space which will allow the placement of all activities under one roof."

A major change recommended in this report would establish six-year, overlapping terms for the three members of the commission, who now serve at the pleasure of the President. Subsequent to the release of the report, a bill

has been introduced under the joint sponsorship of Representative Tom Murray of Tennessee, chairman of the committee, and Representative Edward H. Rees of Kansas, ranking minority member of the committee, which would put this plan into effect beginning March 1, 1957. Enactment of this bill would reverse the trend, started by the recommendations of the Brownlow Committee in 1937, which has favored increased control by the President over the personnel function in the executive branch. A more recent step in this direction—the designation by President Eisenhower of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission as personnel adviser to the President—is also disapproved by the House committee report.

The report of the Senate committee is expected to be ready for release early in June. James R. Watson, executive director, National Civil Service League, has been serving as a consultant to the committee to direct the study and draft findings and recommendations. On February 5, Senator Olin D. Johnston, chairman of the Senate committee, announced the appointment of a five-man Advisory Council of outstanding citizens who will assist the committee in evaluating Mr. Watson's report and advise on final proposals. Members are: James E. Webb, president, Republic Supply Company, Oklahoma City; William C. Foster, executive vice president, Olin Mathieson Chemical Company, New York; David L. Harrington, president, Reuben H. Donnelley Corporation, Chicago; James A. Campbell, president, American Federation of Government Employees, Washington, D. C.; and Clarence H. Osthagen, recently appointed executive director, Tidewater Virginia Development Council, Norfolk.

Employee Rating by Field Review

A plan for rating probationary employees on the basis of an informal interview between a personnel technician and the employee's supervisor, as used in Glendale, California, is described in an article in the January issue of *Public Personnel Review* by Theodore L. Sharp and Larry C. White, "An Approach to Employee Evaluation: The Field Review."

The questions that the personnel technician covers in the field interview are:

1. How is the employee doing?
2. In what ways is he particularly good?
3. What does he do well? Why?
4. In what ways is he particularly weak?
5. What does he do poorly? Why?
6. What help has been given to him?
7. What have the results been?
8. What training has he had?
9. What training does he need?
10. How do you evaluate him in terms of other employees?
11. Should he be given permanent status?

The article reports that the new method has helped personnel technicians overcome some of the most serious criticisms of the more usual checklist. Such a list, with its printed categories and specifically stated questions, has frequently been found to be too rigid and lacking in adaptability for the many types of workers to be evaluated.

The general advantages of the method, compared with the usual rating scale or checklist, include these:

1. In evaluating their employees, supervisors are more willing to "say it" than to "write it."
2. They can use their own words to describe an employee.
3. Questions and answers are in terms of the kind of work performed.
4. The method lends itself to a careful appraisal of an employee's potential.
5. The immediate supervisor of the employee is more likely to make the evaluation.

Lease-Purchase Building Programs

Contracts for architectural and engineering services have been negotiated by the General Services Administration for twenty-three federal buildings to be constructed under the lease-purchase program approved by Congress in 1954. Under this program, projects selected by the GSA and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the Committees on Public Works of the U. S. Senate and the House of Representatives are financed and built by private capital with the understanding that the government will buy them back in the form of rent in not less than ten nor more than twenty-five years. During this period, the buildings remain on the local tax rolls.

A majority of the projects approved thus

far are for post office and court house buildings which will also house the local or regional offices of such federal agencies as the Civil Service Commission, Veterans' Administration, and Treasury, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare departments. However, a contract announced February 19, 1956, provides for designing a new building in New York City for the United States Mission to the United Nations, and another, announced in October, 1955, provided for modification and updating of existing plans and specifications for a new communicable disease center in Atlanta, Georgia.

Construction had not been started on any of the approved projects by mid-April, 1956, but GSA expects work to begin on some of them during the late spring or early summer.

The Post Office Department, which is responsible for negotiating contracts for lease-purchase construction of single-purpose structures for its own use, has signed twenty-six contracts for architectural and engineering service. Construction has not been started on any of these.

The lease-purchase plan has been in use for several years by private industry and more recently by various states and municipalities. An article in the February, 1956, issue of *Public Management* by Ted B. Adsit, "The Lease-Purchase Financing Method," describes some of the projects financed by this method in California and points out some of the advantages and disadvantages of the plan for state and city governments. The main advantage of lease-purchase financing is seen in the fact that it provides an alternative to straight cash or general obligation bond methods. Its chief disadvantage is that it costs more than either of these. The lease-purchase method thrives under favorable economic conditions when there is an abundant supply of private and insurance money available at reasonable rates, but even under these circumstances interest is likely to run from 3.75 to 5.0 per cent. The author of the article concludes that the lease-purchase method is "not the solution to a city's financial problems, but it may have its place . . . in financing the construction of needed public buildings and facilities."

Handbook on Guide Letters

A new handbook published by the General Services Administration of the federal government describes the uses of guide letters and how to decide whether they can be used with profit in any given organization or activity.

Guide letters drafted in advance to serve as patterns in answering constantly recurring questions may greatly reduce the amount of personal dictation time required to handle correspondence of a semiroutine nature. Unlike form letters, which are identical and are mechanically reproduced, letters prepared with the help of guide letters are individually typed and appear to be personally dictated. The GSA handbook includes illustrations and step-by-step instructions on how to draft effective guide letters and how to assemble them in a visibly indexed desk file which is equally useful to supervisors for indicating the appropriate reply and to typists who prepare the letters.

This handbook is the fourth in a series published by the General Services Administration to aid government agencies in reducing and simplifying their paper work. The titles and prices of the four handbooks, which may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., are as follows:

Records Management	$0.20
Plain Letters	0.30
Form Letters	0.25
Guide Letters	0.20

Man vs. Committee

Traffic jams, whether on the streets or in the air, are more likely to be solved under the direction of a single individual, backed by adequate authority, than by interdepartmental committees, in the opinion of experts commenting recently on these two problem areas.

A two-day conference on big city traffic problems at New York University last January discussed the question against the background of action taken earlier by Mayor Robert F. Wagner to establish an Interdepartmental Traffic Advisory Council, the membership of which includes two members of the City Council. Traffic directors from other large cities participating in the conference criticized this

plan because it injected politics into traffic management without responsibility or the power to make decisions. A report of the meeting in *The New York Times* of January 20, 1956, quoted one of the visiting traffic directors as urging that New York's Traffic Commissioner should receive "the authority, the budget, and the staff to do the job. Then, if he fails, fire him and get someone else."

A similar preference for individual responsibility was expressed by a group of aviation leaders in a report released in January *(The Report of the Aviation Facilities Study Group to the Director, Bureau of the Budget,* December 31, 1955, 46 pp.) which dealt with problems arising out of the rapid expansion of air transportation and the increasing congestion of air space. This group recommended that a study of long-range needs for aviation facilities be undertaken "under the direction of an individual of national reputation . . . backed by Presidential authority . . . independently of any of the existing operating departments and interdepartmental committees. . . .

"Unless pursued under independent central direction at a high government level, it is our considered opinion that the studies . . . would very likely be ineffective and wasteful of manhours and expense."

President Eisenhower responded to this set of recommendations by creating in the White House a new staff post of Special Assistant for Aviation Facilities Planning, and appointing to this position on February 11 Major General Edward P. Curtis, vice president, Eastman Kodak Company, who was a pilot in World War I and chief of staff of the Strategic Air Force during World War II.

Urban Transportation Studies

The National Committee on Urban Transportation is conducting test studies in seven cities as part of its program of gathering information to help cities and urban areas solve their growing traffic and transportation problems. Pilot studies were under way by the middle of May in Albuquerque, New Mexico; Crawfordsville, Indiana; Detroit, Michigan; Oak Park, Illinois; Phoenix, Arizona; San Diego, California; and Syracuse, New York.

The national committee is furnishing advisory staff to help each city and participating transit company in organizing the work program and guiding each study at the consultant level. Regular personnel, materials, and any equipment required will be provided at the expense of the cities and companies.

The procedures to be tested are set forth in a manual entitled *Better Transportation for Your City*. The procedures have been developed during the past two years by 160 of the country's top transportation and municipal experts who are members of nine subcommittees of the national committee. Each subcommittee prepared a section of the preliminary manual, as follows: administration; laws and ordinances; financial records and reports; travel desires; measurement of existing street services; inventory of existing street facilities; measurement of existing transit services; recommended standards for street services and facilities; and recommended standards, warrants, and objectives for transit service and facilities.

All pilot studies are to be completed by July 1, 1957. The manual will then be reviewed, revised, and published for the use of officials in all cities who wish to carry out similar fact-gathering programs in an economical and efficient way.

The National Committee on Urban Transportation was formed in May, 1954, by six organizations that have an interest in the urban field: the American Municipal Association, the American Public Works Association, the American Society of Planning Officials, the International City Managers' Association, the Municipal Finance Officers Association, and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers. Later, the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads accepted membership on the committee.

State-Federal Flood Rehabilitation Programs

Eastern seaboard communities which have suffered from the effects of hurricanes and floods during the past two years are seeking solutions to some of their rehabilitation problems through state and federal programs.

North Carolina has begun an investigation of the hurricane effects on both the resort

areas and the low-lying inland forest, agricultural, and urban areas that were inundated by the 1954 and 1955 storms. The study, being conducted at the University of North Carolina, is expected by early 1956 to produce preliminary recommendations about how the people of the state can cope with the threat of more hurricanes and floods.

Following two hurricanes that did extensive damage that year, the Rhode Island Development Council late in 1954 issued an interim report recommending shore line development and zoning to protect lives and property in the event of future storms. Funds from the federal Urban Renewal Administration helped finance the study. In 1955, additional federal planning grants were made to aid three towns that had been struck by the 1954 hurricanes.

Connecticut is using state aid and two federal aid programs in rehabilitating its flood-damaged areas. Federal urban renewal funds have been made available to Torrington for a redevelopment and renewal project in the area that suffered the worst damage in the floods of August, 1955, and Waterbury has a similarly aided "flood renewal" project under way. Federal planning grants have been authorized for fourteen flood-stricken towns and for the Naugatuck and Farmington River valleys, where the emphasis will be on reduction of flood hazards. In addition, Connecticut is using state funds to hire planners for the damaged areas.

Scranton, Pennsylvania, which was also devastated by the floods of last August, is the first city in the country to make use of federal urban renewal funds to rebuild flooded areas. Two badly damaged sections of the city will be replanned and rebuilt with the aid of federal funds.

Regional Planning Developments

A tendency to organize planning activities by areas that cut across both geographical and functional lines has been noted by the American Society of Planning Officials.

Four new districts have been organized in Massachusetts. They are Cape Cod District, Barnstable County area; Merrimac Valley, including Lowell and Lawrence; Neoponset Valley; and the Springfield metropolitan area. A fifth is planned for Fall River and other municipalities of Bristol County.

In Michigan, Jackson and the townships of Leoni, Summit, and Blackman are organizing a regional planning commission "for the physical, social and economic development of the region." State aid is available on a matching basis up to $25,000 annually. Pennsylvania's Allegheny County Planning Commission was reorganized to include the Allegheny County Transit and Traffic Commission. Milwaukee and a number of neighboring counties in Wisconsin are also taking action to organize a planning commission.

On the west coast, the Puget Sound Regional Planning Commission is becoming active. Its jurisdiction covers more than four counties in the Seattle, Washington, area and includes a population of about 1,200,000.

Massachusetts Public Housing Conversion

The state of Massachusetts has recently completed the sale of some 1,750 public housing units to private owners under conditions similar to those which governed the sales approved when the rural slum clearance program was discontinued in 1955 (see Winter, 1956, *Review*, p. 69).

The Massachusetts program was started following the passage in 1946 of a state law authorizing the provision of needed housing for returning World War II servicemen. Under this legislation, the state agreed to reimburse cities for up to 10 per cent of development costs on housing built for veterans, at a rate of 2 per cent each year for five years. Participating cities were to hold title to the housing, and, at the end of the five years, were to sell the structures. Veterans occupying the housing were to have the first chance to buy. Any other veterans were to be given second priority.

The liquidation of the public housing program and its conversion to private ownership has been accomplished to the general satisfaction of everyone concerned. Sale prices have in most cases been high enough to cover the total construction-operation costs to the cities. Even where this was not true, the cities anticipate that the addition of the property to the local tax rolls will soon make up any difference. Buyers have found the housing a

good investment. One veteran was reported to have bought the home in which he was living and sold it a week later at a $1,700 profit.

Most of the housing constructed under this program was in one- or two-family dwellings. Only in Boston were apartment-style buildings used, and it was there that bids failed to approach the amount the city had invested. For example, one 121-unit project, which had cost $1,693,443 to build sold for $607,651, and four projects built for $2,597,139 went for $827,150. Despite this high rate of loss, which will be about 29 per cent for all of the Boston projects, officials believe that the full amount will eventually be recovered now that the property is on the tax rolls.

State-Municipal Tax Activities

State legislatures in 1955 gave permission to a few municipalities to levy new taxes and passed a number of laws concerning the property tax.

Three states broadened revenue sources for local governments. New Mexico authorized cities over 75,000 population to adopt a 1 per cent sales tax, and the only eligible city, Albuquerque, promptly did so. California authorized counties to impose a 1 per cent sales tax if they agreed to have the state administer the tax, and also approved a plan whereby cities may contract with the state to administer a sales tax.

The Illinois legislature authorized adoption by cities of a 0.5 per cent sales tax without referendum and approved a tax on public utility gross receipts up to 5 per cent. The sales tax is administered by the state, which distributes the proceeds to the taxing municipality after the cost of administration is taken out. The charge for administration is set at 6 per cent of the amount collected. By mid-November, following authorization by the legislature, 594 municipalities, including Chicago, had adopted the tax.

Four states—Arkansas, Idaho, Washington, and Montana—started statewide programs of revaluing property for tax purposes. Massachusetts provided that the state tax commission, upon request, should aid localities in setting up assessment systems and provide technical aid and assistance. Other states taking action to provide for state assistance to localities were New Hampshire, Nebraska, Nevada, and South Dakota. South Carolina made an appropriation to finance a study of assessment equalization. Missouri ordered twenty-six counties to raise their valuations. California issued equalization orders to fourteen counties whose assessment levels were below a prescribed minimum. New Jersey and Pennsylvania continued action under a program begun earlier to improve, equalize, or otherwise strengthen assessment practices and assessed values.

Improved Licensing and Permit Procedure

The issuance of police and health department permits has been transferred to the city clerk's office in Los Angeles, California, as a step toward simplifying and centralizing licensing and permit procedures. Surveys were made by the city administration in cooperation with the affected departments before the transfer was made. Officials report that the new procedures have cut substantially the waiting time of applicants. It was found that whereas applicants for police permits used to wait three or four hours at times, they now seldom have to wait more than thirty minutes.

Carnegie Grant to IIE

The Institute of International Education has received a grant of $1.5 million from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to be used for support and development of programs of international student exchange over a ten-year period.

The institute, founded thirty-seven years ago, is a private, nonprofit organization. The exchange program administered by the institute has grown rapidly in recent years. In 1930 the institute helped arrange for 361 scholars to study abroad. Last year the total was 5,837. The number of foreign students in the United States has also grown rapidly. In 1938-39, the total was 6,004. During the academic year 1954-55, the foreign students in this country numbered 34,232.

P. A. Texts in Spanish

The International Cooperation Administration is distributing to its missions in Latin

America two textbooks translated from English into Spanish as part of ICA's translation program intended to help meet the need for public administration literature in Spanish and Portuguese.

The translation and publication of *Public Personnel Administration*, by William E. Mosher, J. Donald Kingsley, and O. Glenn Stahl, were carried out at the University of Puerto Rico under a contract financed and arranged by ICA. *Public Administration*, by Herbert A. Simon, Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor A. Thompson, was translated at the United Nations Advanced School of Public Administration (ESAPAC) in San José, Costa Rica, and the University of Puerto Rico was entrusted with printing and publication for ICA (see Spring, 1955, *Review*, p. 167).

A limited number of copies is being distributed without charge to universities, civic organizations, and governmental agencies and institutions having a major interest in technical assistance in public administration in Latin America.

The immediate aim of this translation program is to help fill the current need for Spanish texts on public administration. It is hoped, however, that it will also stimulate interest in the commercial publication of translations in Spanish and lead to the writing and publication of original texts, adapted to local conditions and needs, in Spanish.

ICA is interested in learning of work in progress on the development of original texts or the translation of material from English into other languages. Information should be sent to the Public Administration Division, International Cooperation Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Iran Institute Publications

The Institute of Administrative Affairs, University of Tehran, has published the first issue (Winter, 1956) of a new quarterly *Journal of Administrative Affairs* and has also begun publication of a monthly *Personnel Newsletter.*

The *Journal* is being printed in Farsi (Persian) and mimeographed in English. The first issue included articles on the institute's program and objectives and Iranian administration, a book review section, and a section on administrative developments throughout the world. The editors will include a translation of an article from a foreign journal in each issue. Mohamad Moghadam, translation and publication coordinator for the institute, is editor-in-chief of the *Journal.* The Editorial Board members are Richard Gable, chairman; Hoyt Crider, research coordinator for the institute; and Mostafa Elm, executive secretary.

The *Personnel Newsletter,* the first of its kind in Iran, is prepared by Mr. Gable for distribution to personnel directors and interested officials in the government. As part of its program of technical assistance in public administration the institute has launched a series of informal meetings with Iranian personnel directors to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas on personnel activities and problems. The *Newsletter* carries reports of these meetings and items of general interest to personnel directors.

The institute was established in the Faculty of Law, University of Tehran, during 1954 under a contract between the University of Southern California and the International Cooperation Administration. The institute faculty, headed by Harry A. Marlow of USC and Moussa Amid, dean of the Law Faculty, UT, includes eight Americans.

New Graduate Program of Political Studies

The Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, which is responsible for fostering political science in France and for the administrative management of the Institut d'Études Politiques de l'Université de Paris, will offer a graduate program of political studies beginning October 1, 1956.

The new program, which is designed for students working toward a master's or Ph.D. degree, will train in political science research a small number of students, selected on the basis of their previous academic record and the interest of their study projects. It will rely mainly upon small selected seminars conducted with the assistance of French and foreign scholars and experts with particular qualifications in the fields of political and international relations.

M. Jacques Chapsal, director of the Institut

d'Études Politiques and executive of the Fondation, is responsible for administration of the program. Further information may be secured by addressing him at Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, Cycle Supérieur d'Études Politiques, 27, rue Saint-Guillaume, Paris 7.

Sixth Inter-American Municipal Congress

Several hundred municipal officials and experts on municipal government from North and South America are expected to attend the sixth Congress of the Inter-American Municipal Organization which will meet in Panama City, Panama, August 14-19, 1956.

Discussions at the Congress will center around the following four topics:

I. Growth and development of urban and suburban areas.

II. Fiscal resources of municipalities in relation to municipal autonomy and the need to assure and strengthen this autonomy within appropriate limits.

III. Evaluation of intermunicipal cooperation with special emphasis on the usefulness of national associations of municipalities.

IV. Scientific management at the executive level as a tool of increased efficiency and better response to local needs.

The municipalities of Panama City and Colón and the national government of the Republic of Panama will act as hosts for the meetings, which will be held in the Hotel Panama. In addition, representatives of the Organization of American States and the U. S. International Cooperation Administration are assisting in the preparations for the Congress.

Further information may be obtained from the American Committee for International Municipal Cooperation, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, or from Dr. Carlos M. Moran, Secretary General, Inter-American Municipal Organization, Obispo 351, Havana, Cuba.

Awards to ASPA Members

Two ASPA members were among the sixteen career civilians in the federal government who have been named recipients of the fourth group of Rockefeller public service awards. The program of awards was established in 1953 to stimulate the continuance and advancement of competent civilians in government service. Recipients are chosen on the basis of "intellectual maturity, leadership, character and competence, interest in public service as a career and particular promise of future usefulness to the Government."

Administered by Princeton University as a national trust under a grant from John D. Rockefeller 3d, the awards are designed to enable the career employees selected to study at colleges of their choice in this country or abroad or to spend time in some comparable educational activity.

The ASPA members chosen and their announced study programs are:

Rufus E. Miles, Jr., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—to explore the possibility of systematically providing basic information to newly appointed top-level government officials.

Albert H. Rosenthal, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Denver)—to study public welfare programs here and abroad that are based on total family needs.

Bernard Rosen, director of the Civil Service Commission's incentive awards program, was one of the ten young men in government to receive an Arthur S. Flemming award this year from the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D. C. These awards, named in honor of the director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, who was formerly a member of the Civil Service Commission, have been made for the past eight years to recognize outstanding achievements by career service employees under 40. Mr. Rosen was honored for his work in spearheading the new and expanded incentive awards program which in seven months last year produced 130,000 suggestions from federal employees which it is estimated will save the government upward of $40 million.

Cornell Journal

Administrative Science Quarterly, a journal devoted to advancing basic understanding of administrative processes in all types of organizations, will be published by the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University, beginning in June, 1956.

It will include articles, book reviews, and abstracts relating to administration as revealed in business, educational, governmental, hospital, military, and similar organizations, as well as materials dealing with administration in various cultural settings.

James D. Thompson is editor of the *Quarterly;* Paul Wasserman is book review editor. The editorial board includes Sune Carlson, Melvin G. de Chazeau, Alexander Leighton, Edward H. Litchfield, and Ewing W. Reilley.

The domestic and foreign subscription rate will be $7.50; there is a special student subscription rate of $4.00. All correspondence should be addressed to Administrative Science Quarterly, Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Annual City Manager Report

The International City Managers' Association published in January, 1956, *Recent Council-Manager Developments and Directory of Council-Manager Cities* (34 pp., $1.00). The information in this publication will be incorporated in *The Municipal Year Book, 1956,* to be published later this year.

In an analysis of 259 appointments to city managerships during 1955 the association found that 161 were entering the profession for the first time, 76 were managers promoted from other cities, and 22 were former managers coming back into the profession. The total number of appointments in 1955 showed an increase of 39 over the figure for 1954, which was 220.

More than one-third—55—of the newcomers to city manager positions were assistant managers, administrative assistants, and interns before becoming full-fledged members of the profession. Seventy-one other newcomers were holding other administrative jobs in government—chiefly as heads of city departments—at the time of their appointment. Fifteen appointees came from nongovernmental positions, mostly from private industry. The background of the remaining 20 appointments was not reported. The 55 appointments to the rank of full manager compares with 36 who came to that position in the year before.

The figures show 80 per cent of all 1955 appointments were made from outside the hiring city, as compared to 75 per cent in the 1954 analysis and 58 per cent for the entire decade of the 1940's.

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
STATEMENT OF INCOME, EXPENDITURES, AND BALANCE
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1955

EARNED INCOME:	
Memberships	
Senior	$19,667.00
Junior and Student	2,375.50
Sustaining	1,607.50
Subscriptions	
Domestic	6,852.50
Foreign	627.00
Total	$31,129.50
Sales of Journals	$ 439.25
Sales of Reprints	345.45
Sales of Cumulative Index	87.00
Sales of Mailing List	140.56
Sales of Membership Directory	468.75
Journal Advertising	594.25
Conference Income	3,743.00
International Institute of Administrative Sciences—U.S. Section	524.80
Subvention from Public Administration Clearing House	8,400.00
Miscellaneous Income	122.54
Total Earned Income	$45,995.10

EXPENDITURES:	
General Society	$ 9,307.53
Council and Council Committees	2,361.99
Membership Service	3,410.53
Membership Directory	1,042.31
Membership Survey	27.68
National Membership Committee	1,776.56
Direct Mail Promotion for Membership	801.19
Chapter Service	1,453.88
Editorial Board	545.33
Public Administration Review	10,895.49
ASPA Newsletter	3,347.59
Annual Conference	6,818.66
International Institute of Administrative Sciences—U.S. Section	851.16
Total Expenditures	$42,639.90
Balance Carried Forward January 1, 1956	$ 2,471.30
Deferred Income (dues paid in 1955 applicable in 1956)	15,274.50
Total Balance and Deferred Income	$17,745.80
REPRESENTED BY:	
Cash in Banks	$17,578.80
Petty Cash Fund	25.00
Accounts Receivable	8.00
Travel Advances	127.06
Clearing Account	6.94
Total	$17,745.80

P[illegible]lic Admini[illegible] Review
1313 [illegible]
Chica[illegible] 37, [illegible]
(Retur[illegible])

Eugene B. Power
University Microfilms
313 N. First Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan